DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 741 SP 005 952

TITLE	A Questionnaire Evaluation System for Teacher Education Centers in Greater Cleveland.
INSTITUTION	Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY	Martha Holden Jennings Foundation, Pittsburgh, Pa.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	236p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Educational Research; *Evaluation; Evaluation Techniques; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

Following a brief overview of the teacher education center movement in Greater Cleveland, a questionnaire evaluation system designed to evaluate the center is described. The system is designed to enable questionnaire responses from student teachers, cooperating teachers, and center coordinators to be developed into two distinct kinds of reports. These reports include a direct report back to the center in the form of a tabulation of the responses of student teachers and cooperating teachers from that particular center and an area-wide summary of all questionnaires from the Metropolitan area. Seventeen centers participated in this pilot study, questionnaires were sent to 193 student teachers and 179 cooperating teachers. Completed questionnaires were returned by 49 percent of the student teachers and 65 percent of the cooperating teachers. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) permitted computerized tabulation of the questionnaires. Tabulation of the 17 coordinators was done manually. Guidelines for the establishment of a similar evaluation system are presented. Appendixes include details of the questionnaire and the SPSS program. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 070741

A QUESTIONNAIRE EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS IN GREATER CLEVELAND

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by
Dr. David E. O'Gorman
Assistant Director for Teacher Education
CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

and

Dr. Rae Rohfeld, Consultant

prepared as part of the

PROJECT TO STIMULATE INNOVATIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION
(SITE PROJECT)

Funded by a Grant from the

Martha Holden Jennings Foundation

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

July, 1972

SP 005 952

FOREWORD

Thanks are in order to many individuals throughout the Cleveland Metropolitan Area who participated in the design and initial use of this evaluation system. Particular thanks is due to David McCrory, Coordinator of the Beachwood Middle School Teacher Education Center, who put together the initial list of questions for inclusion in the questionnaires, and who participated with the members of the Executive Committee of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee in the process of modification and revision of several drafts of each of three questionnaires.

The members of the Executive Committee of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee are:

Dr. Patrick Cosiano, Director of the Cleveland Center for Ohio University

Mr. Jerry Graham, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Shaker Heights High School

Mr. Larry Mervine, Chairman, Social Studies Department, Kirk Junior High School, East Cleveland, Ohio

Miss Edna Stinson, John Carroll University/Cleveland Public Schools MAT Program

Dr. Sally Wertheim, Assistant Professor, John Carroll University

Dr. Rae Rohfeld has served as an objective observer of the Teacher Education Center process for over a year. Her insightful analysis of the data generated from this questionnaire system which appears in Chapter III is particularly appreciated.

Last but not least, thanks to my wife, Mary Ann O'Gorman, who coded the responses to the open ended questions and who wrote the SPSS computer program.

David E. O'Gorman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword		i
I.	The Teacher Education Center Movement in Greater Cleveland.	1
II.	The Design of a Questionnaire Evaluation System.	3
III.	An Evaluation of Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers.	5
IV.	A Guide for the Implementation of The Approach in Other Metropolitan Areas	14

APPENDICES

A. Tabulation of Responses to the Center Coordinator's Survey - Spring 1972

B. Tabulation of Responses to the Cooperating Teacher's Survey - Spring 1972

C. Tabulation of Responses to the Student Teacher's Survey - Spring 1972

D. Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions From The Cooperating Teachers Survey

E. Verbatim Responses to Open-Ended Questions From The Student Teachers Survey

F. Coordinator Questionnaire

G. Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

H. Student Teacher Questionnaire

I. Computer Program - Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

J. Computer Program - Student Teacher Questionnaire

K. Description of The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

I. The Teacher Education Center Movement in Greater Cleveland

With the support of the Martha Holden Jennings Foundation the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education has undertaken a three year activity to Stimulate Innovations in Teacher Education Programs in the Greater Cleveland Schools, Colleges and Universities (SITE Project). The major innovation which the SITE Project selected to stimulate in the Greater Cleveland Metropolitan area is the Teacher Education Center.

Teacher education centers are joint ventures of one or more elementary and secondary schools together with one or more colleges, and are designed to improve the student teaching phase of teacher preparation. The term "center" is somewhat of a misnomer because in this context it refers to a set of innovative activities, rather than a place. Some centers are located in several buildings, and both students and staff have experiences in each building of a center.

The distinction between the conventional approach to student teaching and the center approach may be seen in the following table:

	Problems with the conventional approach	The "Center" approach as a way of resolving the problems
Assignment of Student Teachers	Scattered in many schools.	Clustered in buildings, chosen for particular experiences.
Supervision of Student Teachers	Individual students supervised daily by master teacher, infrequently by college faculty member (referred to as college supervisor). Minimal communication between college and school supervisors. No coordination of in-school activities.	Directly, by master teacher. Indirectly by college supervisor, through teacher. Frequently in-school program has part-time or full-time coordinator.
College Supervisor's Activity	"Circuit-rider" - visiting students in many locations.	Concentrated at center, available to student teachers and to all school personnel as an added resource.
Preparation of master-teacher for supervisory role	Varies--usually minimal.	Workshops and other efforts to incorporate master teacher into teacher training team.
Seminar on teaching	On campus, frequently not related to student teaching experience.	Usually at center, tied to experience in teaching.

Effect on School environment	No direct effort to help school program.	A direct effort made to improve the learning environment within the school.
Variety of Student Teaching Experiences	Usually one classroom with one master teacher. Little opportunity to visit other classes.	Often contact with two or more classes and teaching styles; sometimes assignments are to a teaching team or to a whole department.
Decision-making	College dominated and imposed.	School-college partnership.

As far as the SITE Project is concerned, the essential element which constitutes a center is a school-college partnership. The school-college partnership is manifested by the existence of a "center-team," consisting of representatives of both the school and college.

It is important to emphasize that "Center" strategy is aimed, not at increasing the number of teachers trained, but rather at improving the quality of those who are trained. College and school personnel agree that this is best done through intensive integration of instructional theory with school-based clinical teaching experience. The center concept embodies this bridging approach.

The number of Teacher Education Centers in Greater Cleveland has grown rapidly. Only 5 centers were being planned prior to the start of the SITE Project in mid 1970. By May of 1971, at the end of the first year of SITE, the number in operation grew to 17. During this current 1971-72 school year the number of centers has more than doubled to a total of 35, involving some 50 elementary and secondary schools.

These days innovative approaches in schools do not succeed without the enthusiastic support of the teachers. The rapid growth of centers would not have been possible without their support. Approximately 250 teachers are involved in centers. This is twice what it was one year ago.

The coordination of the teacher education centers movement in Greater Cleveland is achieved through a coordinating committee made up of one representative from each center. Those representatives then elect a 5 member executive committee to handle the ongoing activities of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee. The SITE Project through the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education provides a professional and secretarial staff to the Committee. The full Committee meets several times per year to set policy and monitor progress. The Executive Committee meets monthly with the staff.

II. The Design of a Questionnaire Evaluation System

From the start of the teacher education centers movement in the Greater Cleveland area in 1970-71 the question of how to evaluate teacher education centers was a primary concern. In workshops in October, 1970, February and May of 1971, representatives from teacher education centers in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area began to focus on some of the problems related to the evaluation of centers.

The problem of how to evaluate teacher education centers was an elusive one. In addition to the normal methodological problems involved in any research project, the question of evaluation of teacher education centers was made more difficult because most centers were in early stages of development, and the several colleges and universities working with several school districts spawned a wide variety of approaches to the partnership arrangements called "teacher education centers."

By the time the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee met in December of 1971 the development of centers in the Greater Metropolitan Area had stablized. With that stability came a recognition that there was no one "right" definition of a center, and that the central purposes of attempts to collaborate for the immediate present were to cooperate in gathering feedback from participants in individual centers, sharing information and experience, and planning future cooperation based on those results.

The shift away from the notion that there was one "model" for teacher education centers that could or should be implemented both compounded the evaluation problems and at the same time shed additional light on the nature of the task of evaluation. It became clear that no one research design could encompass the diverse kinds and types of partnership arrangements that were developing. But at the same time there was a recognition that individual centers under development had a need for internal feedback from their cooperating teachers and from their student teachers. At the same time it became apparent that additional information was needed by the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee to monitor and evaluate the rapid growth of centers in the Cleveland Metropolitan Area.

The Coordinating Committee thus decided to undertake a questionnaire evaluation which would (1) provide direct feedback to individual centers, and (2) provide information to the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee for its use in planning future collaborative activities on an area-wide basis. It was further determined that such a system should be set up in a way that would allow easy repetition in succeeding years but in a manner which would allow revisions in the questionnaires.

Thus, the system described in this report is designed to enable questionnaire responses from student teachers, cooperating teachers, and center coordinators to be developed into two distinct kinds of report: 1) a direct report back to the center in the form of a tabulation of the responses of student teachers and cooperating teachers from that particular center, and 2) an area-wide summary of all the questionnaires from the Metropolitan area.

Because of the uncertainties regarding the kinds of questions and methods by which the questionnaires would be tabulated, it was determined that this first approach would be a pilot study of only a group of the centers in operation. Some 17 centers elected to participate in the pilot project.

Questionnaires were sent to 193 student teachers and 179 cooperating teachers. Completed questionnaires were received from 49% of the student teachers and 65% of the cooperating teachers.

It was apparent that the amount of work needed to prepare reports for individual centers as well as for the area-wide summary could be substantial. Therefore, it was decided to utilize the capabilities of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A brief description of SPSS is included in Appendix K. SPSS programs permit the questionnaires to be coded for key punching and put on cards and in one run of the computer the tabulations are printed out for all of the individual centers plus the area-wide total. SPSS was used for the questionnaires of the 116 cooperating teachers and the 94 student teachers. Tabulation of the 17 coordinators was done manually.

Guidelines for the establishment of a similar system either in other metropolitan areas or by a college or university are included in Chapter 4 of this report. The Appendices contain details of the questionnaires, the tabulations, and the SPSS programs.

III. An Evaluation of Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers

by

Dr. Rae Rohfeld

Introduction

In March, 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee, associated with the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers, cooperating teachers and Teacher Education Center Coordinators in 17 Greater Cleveland centers. For most centers, this was the second year of operation. The purpose of the study was both to assess the current quality of teacher education in the centers and to test and refine some tools to be used for yearly evaluation of the centers. From the earliest period of the center movement one of the concerns has been the necessity of developing an evaluation system. This report will analyze the composite data on centers obtained through the questionnaires, and discuss the implications of the data in both areas of concern: the teacher education process and the center evaluation process.

Separate questionnaires were sent to center coordinators, cooperating teachers, and student teachers. They were returned by 17 coordinators, 116 cooperating teachers, and 94 student teachers.

The Teacher Education Process

A. The Development of TEC Characteristics

Do we really have Teacher Education Centers? A number of questions relate to the extent to which the student teaching environments are becoming actual teacher education centers. The data casts light on five TEC characteristics.

1. School-college partnership in teacher education

The partnership approach is central to the concept of a teacher education center, and shared decision-making might be viewed as the essence of such a partnership. In response to question 11 in the coordinators' questionnaire, 70.6% reported that the college or university and school have a mechanism for cooperatively determining general policy. Only 25% of those responding "yes" think the mechanism is extremely useful; the remainder find it "somewhat useful."

In regard to specific decisions, 58.8% of the coordinators report that they assign student teachers to cooperating teachers,[1] either on their own or in cooperation with others, and 53% report that cooperating teachers were chosen either by center coordinators or jointly by school and college personnel.[2] 69% of the cooperating teachers said expectations of them were jointly determined by school and college.[3] Since the center coordinators theoretically represent the school and college jointly, their responsibilities, decisions, and activities may be regarded as representing the partnership. (This assumption might be limited somewhat by the fact that 53% of the coordinators are paid entirely by the colleges and only 11.8% clearly indicate shared contributions to their salaries).[4] On the other hand, when we come to coordinator's question 18,

"Who makes decisions about student teaching?" only 35.3% report the decisions are shared equally; 35.3% state the college, mainly, makes them, and 23.5% say the school personnel are mainly responsible.

It appears that the centers could profitably examine the issue of the school-college (or university) partnership, focussing on the question, "What is the nature of the teacher education partnership?"

2. Breadth and Variety of Experience

The main information on breadth and variety of training experience comes from questions 7 and 27 - 30 in the student teacher questionnaire which deal with the number and grade levels of teachers with whom student teachers have contact. 42.6% of the students indicate that only one teacher helps them; 33% report two help them. Still, 60.7% of the students say they work with other teachers frequently or very frequently. The work is almost always on one grade level, however, for only 27.7% say they work with other grade levels frequently or very frequently. The responses show only a little more variety when it comes to studying other experiences--59% say they study other teachers frequently or very frequently, but only 33% study other grade levels as often. Perhaps as a result of this limited exposure, 83% of the student teachers want to teach the same age group when they get jobs.[5]

3. Clustering students to build a community

A center is envisioned as an environment in which enough students may be grouped to 1) provide peer group support and sharing, and 2) to warrant the full time commitment of a college faculty member. Among center coordinators, 53% report centers training 6-10 students per term, and 35% report centers training 1-5 students per term. Only 11.8% (2 centers out of 17) had more than 10 student teachers per term.[6] Centers might wish to consider what the optimal size is for meeting their goals.

4. Roles of center staff members

In the center concept one expects college faculty members to view themselves as trainers of trainers, working through cooperating teachers to train student teachers. Cooperating teachers should in turn view themselves as teacher trainers. The survey did not question subjects about their role perceptions, but their activities and training has some bearing on identifying the respective roles. Among center coordinators, 64.7% have had no training for the coordinator's position; of those who have had training, 50% found it extremely helpful and 33.3% found it somewhat helpful.[7] 53% of the coordinators report that they plan and implement the in-service programs in the school related to student teaching, and 82% say they hold seminars for cooperating teachers.[8] What occurs in these sessions is not clear, however, for 63.8% of the cooperating teachers say they were not trained for supervision,[9] and 26.7% of the cooperating teachers suggest training for cooperating teachers as the most effective contribution universities could make to help them be more effective professionals.[10] While many felt a need for training, 51% of the

cooperating teachers either could not say what they were unprepared for or did not feel they were unprepared for any aspect of their responsibility to student teachers,[11] and 69.1% of the student teachers thought their cooperating teachers were extremely competent with them.[12]

5. Teacher education continuum

A strong point of the center concept is that it can provide an environment for teacher education from pre-student teaching field work through student teaching to in-service education for professional teachers and administrators. The questionnaires did not deal with pre-student teaching activities, but the number of times the need for earlier field experience was mentioned indicates that most centers do not focus on these activities. On the other end of the continuum, 41% of the coordinators say they provide in-service not related to student teaching[13] but in responding to what major thing the colleges could do to help the coordinators be more effective, the suggestion they made most often (23.5%) was "provide more meaningful inservice".[14] The same suggestion was made by 10.3% of the cooperating teachers, and represented their second-highest choice, after training as cooperating teachers.[15] The ability to utilize the teacher education center for training at all levels may depend to a great extent on clarification of the nature of the school-college partnership mentioned in item one.

B. The Student Teaching Experience

1. Student Teacher Satisfaction

Students overwhelmingly liked their student-teaching experience, with 66% answering they "definitely" liked it, and 25% answering "somewhat".[16] What they liked best about it was their cooperating teacher; this was offered as the best liked aspect by 37% of the respondees.[17] They found the cooperating teacher to be extremely helpful (72.3%), extremely competent in teaching (75.5) and extremely competent with the student teacher (69.1%).[18] 92.6% felt that the amount of responsibility given to them was just about right.[19] As one would expect, the need for more training for cooperating teachers was felt by the cooperating teachers themselves or by the center coordinators, but never suggested by the students.

2. Coordinators' time commitment

In operating the centers, 35.3% of the coordinators report spending up to 20% of their time on duties related to student teachers and/or cooperating teachers, and another 35.3% of the coordinators report spending 20 to 40% of their time on these duties.[19] Coordinators tend to see this time as insufficient, for, when asked what one thing the school could do to help them be more effective, 23.5% answered that it could provide more release time, and 17.6% said that it could provide more time to work with student teachers

and cooperating teachers.[20]

3. The Field Experience Component

One change which all three groups agreed on was the need for more and better field experience to start earlier in the students' education. As one student put it, "Student teachers [should] be more prepared in practical matters before stepping into the classroom".[21] A cooperating teacher thought earlier classroom exposure was important because, "a student should be in the position earlier in his schooling to determine if teaching is what he truly wants and can do. ..."[22] Testing one's interest and developing more practical competence were commonly cited reasons for wanting earlier field experience. Earlier field experience is also supported by students' responses on the utility of their education courses. 36.2% said the courses were somewhat helpful, 21.3% were neutral about them, and only 14.9% found them extremely helpful.[23] On the other hand, after entering student teaching, 61.7% of the students found the content of the education courses more meaningful.[24] This result indicates that the field experiences and methods courses reinforce each other. Bringing them into a closer relationship might increase the satisfaction with the total teacher education process.

4. Competence in student teaching

At the start of student teaching, 39.7% of the cooperating teachers found their student teachers very well prepared; 23.3% thought they were somewhat well prepared, and 22.4% gave a neutral response.[25] While 95.7% of the students felt competent in content[26] only 31% of the cooperating teachers found them extremely knowledgeable in subject matter, and 52.8% found them somewhat competent.[27] In relating to kids, 43.1% of the cooperating teachers found their students extremely good and 34.5% thought they did fairly well.[28] They saw them relating slightly better to adults, with 49.1% responding "extremely well" and 34.5% "fairly well."[29] These responses may relate to the above considerations concerning prior preparation, and the positive responses might be increased by earlier field experience and counselling of education majors.

5. Seminars

The seminar is required with student teaching but while 66% of the students definitely liked student teaching, only 6.4% found the seminars extremely useful, and only 22% felt they were able to share experiences heavily with other student teachers. 50% felt they shared experiences a moderate amount, and 27% felt they had no opportunity to share experiences. 59.6% thought the seminar somewhat useful, and 33% said it was not at all useful.[30] In other words, in regard to both sharing opportunities and utility, the number of students reporting no benefit exceeded the number reporting heavy benefits.

The individual center data gives some indication that on-site seminars are more successful than seminars at the college--possibly because the on-site seminars involve students at only one location and can focus more directly on a shared experience. On the other hand, there is a good deal of variation in responses among the different on-site seminars.

6. Effect of Student Teaching Experience

By and large the student teaching experience tends to confirm or intensify prior expectations. 69.1% of the student teachers found the schools as they expected,[31] and their concept of kids unchanged.[32] Largest changes came in the student teachers' concepts of themselves, where 30.9% found themselves more confident,[33] and in the concept of teaching, where 25.5% found it more demanding[34] than they had expected. Cooperating teachers were also confirmed in their educational philosophies. 16.4% did not respond to the question on how their philosophies had changed, 45.7% said there was no change, and 12.1% thought the experience with student teachers had broadened their philosophies.[35]

C. Meeting Professional and Community Needs

1. The Communities receiving new teachers.

The Teacher Education Centers studied are preparing students to teach in suburban schools. 76.6% of the student teachers are in suburban schools, 13.8% in urban schools, and 5.3% in inner city schools.[36] These are much like the elementary and secondary schools they attended: 55.3% went to suburban schools and 25.5% went to urban, non-inner city schools.[37] The students wish to stay in similar schools: 55.3% prefer suburban teaching jobs, 16% prefer urban, non-inner-city jobs, and only 4.3% seek inner-city teaching positions.[38] Both the students and their cooperating teachers consider the new teachers best prepared for suburban schools and then, in order, they are prepared for urban, rural, and inner city situations. Cooperating teachers find fewer students "very well prepared" than students report in every category.[39]

The largest number of students (37.2%) chose their schools because they were convenient and they liked them. 30.9% had no choice.[40] Only a few chose the school because of a training goal, such as wanting an open school. A few students wanted a particular cooperating teacher. One did choose an inner-city school because he wanted that experience, and another chose the only school approved of by the university that had majority black student population.[41] If needs for non-suburban schools are going to be met, the students will obviously require a heavy amount of planned exposure to inner-city and rural schools and encouragement to take student teaching in such schools.

2. Community Relations

Despite increasing interest in community schools and community participation in the schools, only 18% of the student teachers are extremely aware of community resources, and 22% are not at all aware.[42] This contrasts markedly with the 50% who are extremely familiar with resources in their schools.[43] This suggests the need for further exploration of school-community relationships within the teacher education process.

D. Implications for Action

1. Center staffs (coordinator, cooperating teachers, and related school and college personnel) should define more clearly the Teacher Education Center model they are working toward. They should consider particularly the nature of the partnership they desire, the respective roles of center staff members, and the optimal size of the center. The Cleveland Commission on Higher Education could support this effort by providing resources--written or personal--on alternative models and their implications.

2. Considerable attention and planning should be given to starting significant classroom experiences as early as the freshman year. Methods courses should be revised and correlated with the field experience. These field experiences could provide a basis for students to choose student teaching assignments with more consideration of their personal learning goals instead of depending on less educationally significant criteria, such as convenience.

3. In as much as the student teaching experience appears to set expectations and preferences, consideration should be given to expanding student teacher experiences in regard to grade levels, teaching styles, and learning environments. Special efforts should be made to develop centers with inner-city schools. The Cleveland Commission on Higher Education could help seek inner-city sites and help establish school-college relationships.

4. Centers should reexamine their seminars and find ways to relate them to student teacher needs. One approach which they should consider are on-site seminars planned by the student teachers.

5. Means should be developed to involve community people in the center and to involve student teachers in the community--at least to the extent that the students can use community resources in their teaching.

The Center Evaluation Process

A. The Questionnaires

Some changes in the questionnaires would clarify the meaning of questions, simplify tabulation, and assure that the tabulations accurately reflect the individual answers.

The following general principles should guide revision of the three questionnaires:

1. The center concept should be reflected in questions and in answer choices. Many questions force distinctions between school and college or university without providing for "center" as an alternative. Also, some of the questions are difficult for centers where students and cooperating teachers are in other than a 1:1 relationship.

2. In questions where answers fall on a scale, the scale should be revised from a point on a line to a choice of words which will be maintained in the tabulation.

3. Open-ended questions should be avoided as much as possible, since the information they provide is difficult to group and utilize for purposes of improving teacher education. While open-ended questions might be justified in the first questionnaire in order to establish a list of meaningful choices, future questionnaires should be designed to force choices. Open-ended questions could continue to be used when new questions are being tested as additions to the questionnaire; the following year the new question would be incorporated as a forced choice question with the selection of the choices coming, at least partly, from the previous year's answers.

4. The next questionnaires might well reflect the view of one student teacher who said, "Terms such as 'kids' and 'flunky' don't sound very good."

An appropriate role for the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education would be to revise the questionnaires yearly, with the advice of The Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee. In addition, the Commission should distribute the questionnaires, when directed by the TECCC; evaluate the collective data; and circulate the tabulations and over-all evaluation report.

2. Center Evaluation of the Data

Each center must feel confident of its goals,--of the model it has set for itself--in order to have criteria by which to judge the data provided by the questionnaires. This is another reason for individual centers to spend some time focusing on self-definition. Where discrepancies between goals and reality occur, the center needs to find means to bring them closer together. Before the staff can decide on a plan of action, more information may be necessary. Part of the analysis, therefore, involves determining what further information the individual center needs and how it should obtain that information.

Most of the data will not be useful for program improvement until the center personnel can answer the questions, "What does it mean?" or "Why is it this way?" as well as, "Is this what we want to happen?" For example, why do most student teachers want to continue teaching in schools and grades similar to those of their student teaching experience? Is it because they chose their student-teaching experience based on strong knowledge of themselves and the schools, or is it because their student-teaching class is all they know? Or, to take another example, is it desirable that, for many students, their concept of themselves did not change during student teaching? Were they so well-aware of themselves before, or did they simply not receive any help toward increasing self-knowledge. Likewise, is it a strength or a weakness that the educational philosophies of cooperating teachers did not change as a result of working with a student teacher? A desirable outcome in the data cannot be accepted at face value; it is truly desirable only if it is the product of underlying conditions desired by the center.

Once the center identifies necessary changes, it enters into a new program planning phase. It might wish to go beyond its current personnel for help in program improvement. For instance, if the problem involves how to make the seminar more useful, past or present students should help plan improvements. Perhaps the students should run the seminar, or at least participate in its organization. If the center wants to work on its relationships with the community, then community people should participate in program planning. Thus regular evaluation becomes a recurring phase in the process of center development.

In order to assist centers in using their evaluation data for development purposes, the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education could sponsor workshops on the analysis and interpretation of such data. The workshops could utilize case studies from other situations and simulations of decision-making based on survey data to help the participants sharpen their evaluation skills. At least two people from each center should participate in such a workshop. They might then conduct a similar workshop for their own center members.

As centers change and improve their programs, they will, in turn, need to ask new questions in their surveys. Thus, having a means for regularly revising the questionnaire takes on added importance.

Conclusion:

The 1972 Survey of Teacher Education Centers in Greater Cleveland tested a method of evaluation which, after some adjustments are made, and after an evaluation plan is completed, can function on a regular basis with a small amount of professional support from the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education. The survey also pinpointed areas within teacher education which require attention and improvement. While each center must attend to these in accordance with its own image and goals, the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee and the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education can provide means for exchanging experiences and resources and for bringing in expertise related to the concerns of both small groups of centers and the total center movement in Greater Cleveland.

Notes on Chapter III

[1] CC - question 9

[2] CC - question 12

[3] CT - question 15

[4] CC - question 8

[5] ST - question 16

[6] CC - question 1

[7] CC - question 3

[8] CC - question 5

[9] CT - question 2

[10] CT - question 25

[11] CT - question 24

[12] ST - question 5

[13] CC - question 5f

[14] CC - question 14

[15] CT - question 25

[16] ST - question 1

[17] ST - question 2

[18] ST - question 5

[19] CC - question 4

[20] CC - question 15

[21] ST - Verbatim responses, p. 15

[22] CT - verbatim responses, p. 7

[23] ST - question 23

[24] ST - question 24

[25] CT - question 17

[26] ST - question 38a

[27] CT - question 6

[28] CT - question 7

KEY

CC: Center Coordinator Questionnaire

CT: Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire

ST: Student Teacher Questionnaire

[29] CT - question 8

[30] ST - questions 4 c & d.

[31] ST - question 25

[32] ST - question 33

[33] ST - question 34

[34] ST - question 26

[35] CT - question 22

[36] ST - question 43d

[37] ST - question 43c

[38] ST - question 21

[39] CT - questions 13a-d; ST questions 13 a-d

[40] ST - question 31

[41] ST - verbatim responses, pp. 22-26

[42] ST - question 40

[43] ST - question 39

IV. A Guide for the Implementation of This Approach in Other Metropolitan Areas

The approach to evaluating teacher education centers as described in this report could be adapted for use by other metropolitan coordinating bodies and by individual colleges or universities involved in a number of teacher education centers. Some adaption and modifications to the questionnaires would need to be made in order to insure that the results meet the needs of the users.

The following points are suggested as guidelines for those who might be interested in such an implementation of this basic approach:

1. Modification of questionnaires. (See Appendices F, G, and H for copies of questionnaires). The questionnaires used in this report would need to be modified so that the questions could yield responses that were directly related to the unique teacher education situation of the users. Many of the questions in the questionnaires are open-ended where they should be checklists and some are ambiguous in terms of their wording. Additional questions would need to be added. (See Chapter 3 for a discussion of some needed modifications).

2. Locating an SPSS Program. A computer facility (probably at a local college or university) which has in its library of programs the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences should be located. A meeting with representatives of the facility who are familiar with SPSS should be arranged. The revised questionnaire should be shown to them as well as the questionnaire and tabulations and programs from this study. The result of that meeting should be a plan for the editing and coding procedures, the key punching, and the preparation of the SPSS program. Costs should also be discussed. A range of possible cost would be $50.00 to several hundred dollars, depending on the length of the questionnaires, the computer costs, and who does the editing, coding, and programming. (See Appendices I, J, and K for sample SPSS programs).

3. Distribution of the Questionnaires. The final versions of the questionnaires should be prepared. It is suggested that they be printed on different colored paper in order to simplify the handling of the returned questionnaires. These questionnaires can be distributed in a number of ways. The ways used in the pilot version of the study were:

 a. A direct mailing of the questionnaire including a stamped, return envelope to individual student teachers and cooperating teachers at the school in which they were teaching. In order to do this a list of the names of those personnel were obtained from each center prior to the mailing.

 b. Some of the questionnaires in this study were hand delivered by the College representatives to centers; however, they included a stamped self-returned envelope. The returned envelope was provided to insure the confidentiality of the responses.

4. Handling the Returned Questionnaires. Depending upon the plans made in the meeting with the computer installation staff, the questionnaires need to be edited, coded, key punched and run through the SPSS program. These steps can either be accomplished by the computer installation staff or by those conducting the survey. Verbatim responses to open-ended questions may want to be typed directly from the questionnaires in separate reports. (See Appendices D and E for samples of such verbatim responses). These verbatim responses were also coded and tabulated in the regular SPSS programs.

5. Distribution of Reports. After proofing the first computer print-out, the appropriate number of copies should be prepared either on the computer, through the use of carboned print-out paper, or through other reproduction techniques. It is suggested that three copies of the print-out for each center be prepared: one copy going to the school; one copy going to the university or college; and one copy retained in a central file. In addition, all centers and colleges should receive copies of the area summary totals for comparison purposes.

6. Workshops and Other Analyses. Since the objective of this type of evaluation is to provide information useful for the modification of teacher education centers, it may be useful to consider planning workshops or other activities to help personnel involved in teacher education centers to analyze the data provided through the tabulations and develop goals which would modify their particular programs. In addition, many types of analyses could be performed on the resulted data. Care must be taken to insure the confidentiality of responses and to assure that individual centers or programs or personnel are not embarrassed by the results. Misuse of the data will insure that future cooperation will be seriously impaired.

Members of the Greater Cleveland Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee would be happy to share on a personal basis their experiences with this approach. They can be reached by contacting Chairman, Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee, c/o Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Phone: Area code 216 241-7583.

APPENDIX A

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO

THE

CENTER COORDINATOR'S SURVEY - SPRING 1972

CONDUCTED BY THE

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

AS PART OF THE SITE PROJECT

FUNDED BY A GRANT FROM THE

MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

CLEVELAND, OHIO

MAY, 1972

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 01. HOW MANY STUDENT TEACHERS ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR PER TERM?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
1-5 STUDENT TEACHERS	6	35.3	35.3	35.3
6-10 STUDENT TEACHERS	9	53.0	53.0	88.2
11-15 STUDENT TEACHERS	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
21-30 STUDENT TEACHERS	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 02. HOW MANY COOPERATING TEACHERS ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR PER TERM?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
1-5 COOPERATING TEACHERS	6	35.3	35.3	35.3
6-10 COOPERATING TEACHERS	7	41.2	41.2	76.4
11-15 COOPERATING TEACHERS	2	11.8	11.8	88.2
16-20 COOPERATING TEACHERS	2	11.8	11.8	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 03. HAVE YOU ANY COURSEWORK, WORKSHOP OR FORMAL TRAINING ON BEING A COORDINATOR? IF YES HOW HELPFUL?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO TRAINING	11	64.7	MISSING	- -
YES--EXTREMELY HELPFUL	3	17.6	50.0	50.0
YES--SOMEWHAT HELPFUL	2	11.8	33.3	83.3
YES--NOT AT ALL HELPFUL	1	5.9	16.7	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 04. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR TIME IS SPENT ON DUTIES RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHERS AND/OR COOPERATING TEACHERS?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
0-20% OF TIME	6	35.3	35.3	35.3
20-40% OF TIME	6	35.3	35.3	70.6
40-60% OF TIME	2	11.8	11.8	82.3
60-80% OF TIME	1	5.9	5.9	88.2
80-100% OF TIME	2	11.8	11.8	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 5A. DO YOU TEACH ANY COURSES AT A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
YES	11	64.7	64.7	64.7
NO	6	35.3	35.3	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

QUES 5B. DO YOU PLAN THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS IN YOUR SCHOOL RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING?

NO ANSWER	4	23.5	MISSING	--
YES	9	53.0	69.2	69.2
NO	4	23.5	30.8	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

QUES 5C. DO YOU IMPLEMENT THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS IN YOUR SCHOOL RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING?

NO ANSWER	4	23.5	MISSING	--
YES	9	53.0	69.2	69.2
NO	3	17.6	23.1	92.3
YES & NO	1	5.9	7.7	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 5D. DO YOU HOLD SEMINARS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	3	17.6	MISSING	--
YES	10	58.8	71.4	71.4
NO	4	23.5	28.6	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	

QUES 5E. DO YOU HOLD SEMINARS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS?

NO ANSWER	1	5.9	MISSING	--
YES	14	82.3	87.5	87.5
NO	2	11.8	12.5	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	

QUES 5F. DO YOU PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING NOT RELATED TO STUDENT TEACHING?

NO ANSWER	1	5.9	MISSING	--
YES	7	41.2	43.8	43.8
NO	8	47.0	50.0	93.8
YES & NO	1	5.9	6.2	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 06. HAVE YOU SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM?
IF YES; WHAT WAS THE RESPONSE?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9	MISSING	--
NO SUGGESTIONS MADE	2	11.8	MISSING	--
IGNORED, NO RESPONSE	3	17.6	21.4	64.2
REPLIED TO, NO ACTION	3	17.6	21.4	21.4
RECEPTIVE, FAVORABLE	3	17.6	21.4	42.8
IMPLEMENTED	2	11.8	14.4	78.6
YES--NOT SPECIFIED	3	17.6	21.4	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 07. WHAT CHANGES IN THE TEACHER PREPARATION SYSTEM, WOULD YOU MAKE IF YOU COULD?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	3	17.6	MISSING	--
NO CHANGES NEEDED, NONE	2	11.8	MISSING	--
EARLIER FIELD EXPERIENCES	7	41.2	58.4	58.4
MORE AUTHORITY FOR COOPERATING TEACHER	1	5.9	8.3	66.7
MORE RESPONSIBILITY FOR COORDINATOR	1	5.9	8.3	75.0
LONGER S.T. UNDER TEAM TEACHING SYSTEM	1	5.9	8.3	83.3
BETTER METHODS COURSES	2	11.8	16.7	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 08. IS YOUR SUPERVISORY WORK PART OF GRADUATE STUDIES OR SOME OTHER PROGRAM FOR WHICH YOU ARE NOT PAID? IF NO, BY WHOM ARE YOU PAID?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
YES	2	11.8	MISSING	--
NO-COLLEGE	9	53.0	60.0	60.0
NO-SCHOOL DISTRICT	1	5.9	6.7	66.7
NO-NO PERCENTAGE INDICATED	2	11.8	13.2	79.9
NO-25% COLLEGE; 75% SCHOOL DISTRICT	1	5.9	6.7	86.6
NO-33% COLLEGE; 67% SCHOOL DISTRICT	1	5.9	6.7	93.3
NO-10% RELEASE TIME	1	5.9	6.7	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 09. DO YOU ASSIGN STUDENT TEACHERS TO COOPERATING TEACHERS? IF NOT WHO DOES?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
YES--ASSIGN STUDENT TEACHERS	8	47.0	47.0	47.0
NO--DIRECTOR LAB EXPERIENCES	5	29.4	29.4	76.4
NO--COOPERATIVELY	1	5.9	5.9	82.3
NO--DEAN	1	5.9	5.9	88.2
NO--COOPERATIVELY WITH TEACHERS	1	5.9	5.9	94.1
NO--ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 10. WERE OTHERS EXPECTATIONS OF YOU MADE CLEAR BEFORE YOU BEGAN?

		ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER		2	11.8	MISSING	--
YES		10	58.8	66.7	66.7
NO		5	29.4	33.3	100.0
	TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 11. DO THE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY AND THE SCHOOL HAVE A MECHANISM FOR COOPERATIVELY DETERMINING GENERAL POLICY? IF YES--HOW USEFUL?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9	MISSING	--
NO	4	23.5	MISSING	--
YES--EXTREMELY USEFUL	3	17.6	25.0	25.0
YES--SOMEWHAT USEFUL	9	53.0	75.0	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 12. HOW WERE COOPERATING TEACHERS CHOSEN, AND BY WHOM?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
DIRECTOR	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
COORDINATOR	5	29.4	29.4	35.3
PRINCIPALS & DEANS	2	11.8	11.8	47.0
PRINCIPALS & DEPT. CHAIRMEN	2	11.8	11.8	58.8
VOLUNTEERED	2	11.8	11.8	70.6
ENTIRE STAFF	1	5.9	5.9	76.4
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL	1	5.9	5.9	82.3
COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE, DEAN & DIRECTOR LAB EXPERIENCES	2	11.8	11.8	94.1
OTHER	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 13. WHICH COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES SEND STUDENT TEACHERS TO YOU?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9
ST. JOHN	5	29.4
CASE WESTERN RESERVE	5	29.4
CLEVELAND STATE	6	35.3
BALDWIN-WALLACE	1	5.9
JOHN CARROLL	2	11.8
KENT	2	11.8
CENTRAL STATE	1	5.9
BOWLING GREEN	1	5.9
OHIO UNIVERSITY	3	17.6
TOTAL	27*	158.9*

*SUMS TO MORE THAN THE 17 RESPONDENTS OR 100% BECAUSE OF MULTIPLE MENTIONS.

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 14. WHAT ONE MAJOR THING COULD THE COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES DO TO HELP YOU BE MORE EFFECTIVE IN YOUR JOB?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	3	17.6
PROVIDE MORE MEANINGFUL IN-SERVICE	4	23.5
PROVIDE MORE INDEPENDENCE	1	5.9
BECOME MORE AWARE OF OUR TIME DEMANDS & SCHEDULES	1	5.9
CONTINUE RELEASE TIME	1	5.9
ALLOW DECISION MAKING TO TAKE PLACE IN CENTER	1	5.9
PROVIDE BETTER METHODS COURSE	1	5.9
WORK WITH COOPERATING TEACHERS	1	5.9
PROVIDE MORE KNOWLEDGE ON STUDENT TEACHING	1	5.9
REACH MORE FORMAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND SYSTEMS INVOLVED	1	5.9
CLOSER LIAISON, IDENTIFY PROSPECTIVE S.T. SOONER	1	5.9
ADJUST CLASS SCHEDULES OF S.T.	2	11.8
TOTAL	18*	106.0*

*SUMS TO MORE THAN THE 17 RESPONDENTS OR 100% BECAUSE OF MULTIPLE MENTIONS.

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 15. WHAT ONE MAJOR THING COULD YOUR SCHOOL DO TO HELP YOU BE MORE EFFECTIVE IN YOUR JOB?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	4	23.5	MISSING	--
PROVIDE MORE TIME TO WORK WITH S.T. & COOPERATING TEACHERS	3	17.6	23.3	23.3
ESTABLISH A SYSTEM-WIDE COMMITMENT TO TEACHER CENTER CONCEPT	1	5.9	7.7	31.0
PROVIDE MORE RELEASE TIME	4	23.5	30.8	61.7
CLEARLY DEFINE ROLE OF COORDINATOR	1	5.9	7.7	69.4
HAVE A DEPARTMENT HEAD	1	5.9	7.7	77.0
ESTABLISH SYSTEM-WIDE COORDINATION FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE & INSERVICE	1	5.9	7.7	84.7
MORE INDEPENDENCE	1	5.9	7.7	92.3
COULD ASK FOR NO MORE THAN I HAVE NOW	1	5.9	7.7	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 16. WHAT ONE MAJOR THING COULD YOU DO TO HELP YOU BE MORE EFFECTIVE ON YOUR JOB?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	3	17.6	MISSING	--
MORE TIME	1	5.9	7.1	7.1
MORE TIME TO SPEND WITH STUDENT TEACHER	3	17.6	21.4	28.5
MORE TIME TO SPEND WITH COOPERATING TEACHER	1	5.9	7.1	35.6
MORE TIME DEVOTED TO THE CENTER	1	5.9	7.1	42.8
MEET WITH OTHER SUPERVISORS & COORDINATORS	1	5.9	7.1	49.9
ACQUIRE GROUP PROCESS SKILLS & SIMULATION TECHNIQUES	1	5.9	7.1	57.1
MORE READING ON EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION	2	11.8	14.3	71.4
ATTEND MORE WORKSHOPS, VISITATIONS TO OTHER CENTERS	1	5.9	7.1	78.6
HAVE A BETTER BACKGROUND IN EDUCATIONAL COURSES	1	5.9	7.1	85.7
PROVIDE BETTER IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS. CONDUCT OWN SEMINARS	1	5.9	7.1	92.9
PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE SCHOOL TO S.T. & HELP THEM GET EXPERIENCES BESIDES CLASSROOM	1	5.9	7.1	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 17. WHAT TYPE OF SCHOOL ARE YOU INVOLVED WITH?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
SUBURBAN	13	76.4	76.4	76.4
URBAN (OTHER THAN INNER CITY)	3	17.7	17.7	94.1
SUBURBAN & URBAN	1	5.9	5.9	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 18. WHO MAKES THE DECISIONS ABOUT STUDENT TEACHING?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9	5.9	5.9
MAINLY BY COLLEGE	6	35.3	35.3	41.2
MAINLY BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL	4	23.5	23.5	64.7
SHARED EQUALLY	6	35.3	35.3	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

FILE COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SUBFILE ALL

VARIABLE QUES 19. DOES YOUR SCHOOL HAVE A JOINT COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY/SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMITTEE?

	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	1	5.9	MISSING	--
YES	3	17.7	18.8	18.8
NO	13	76.4	81.2	100.0
TOTAL	17	100.0	100.0	100.0

APPENDIX B

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE COOPERATING TEACHERS SURVEY - SPRING 1972

Conducted By The

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS COORDINATING COMMITTEE

As part of the SITE Project

Funded by a Grant from the

MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

In March of 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers and cooperating teachers from teacher education centers operating in the Greater Cleveland area. Verbatim responses are available in a separate report. This report presents the tabulation of responses from cooperating teachers. Responses from Student Teachers are available in a separate report.

METRO AREA TOTALS

Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
Cleveland, Ohio

April, 1972

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR001 AWARE BEFORE WOULD HAVE STUDENT TEACHER.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
WEEK OR LESS	2.	8	6.9	7.1	7.1
2-3 WEEKS	3.	18	15.5	16.1	23.2
4-5	4.	27	23.3	24.1	47.3
6-7	5.	24	20.7	21.4	68.7
8-9	6.	10	8.6	8.9	77.7
10-11	7.	7	6.0	6.3	83.9
OVER 11	8.	8	6.9	7.1	91.1
YES - NOT SPECIFIED	9.	10	8.6	8.9	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	0	.0	MISSING	100.0
NO	1.	4	3.4	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 5.009

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 112
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 4

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR002 IF TRAINED FOR SUPERVISOR--HOW HELPFUL.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO	1.	74	63.8	63.8	63.8
YES, EXTREMELY	2.	13	11.2	11.2	75.0
YES, SOMEWHAT	3.	26	22.4	22.4	97.4
YES, NOT AT ALL	4.	3	2.6	2.6	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.638

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR003 ASK FOR STUDENT TEACHER.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	2	1.7	1.7	1.7
NO	1.	80	69.0	69.0	70.7
YES	2.	34	29.3	29.3	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.276

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR004 IF HAD S.T.BEFORE WAS EXPERIENCE HELPFUL

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	.9	.9
NO	1.	35	30.2	30.2	31.0
YES, EXTREMELY	2.	52	44.8	44.8	75.9
YES, SOMEWHAT	3.	23	19.8	19.8	95.7
YES, NOT AT ALL	4.	2	1.7	1.7	97.4
YES, NOT SPECIFIED	5.	3	2.6	2.6	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.991

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NORDLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR005 HAVE ASSISTANCE DURING TERM.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	4	3.4	3.4	3.4
YES-COLLEGE OR UNIV.	1.	59	50.9	50.9	54.3
YES-SCHOOL DISTRICT	2.	2	1.7	1.7	56.0
YES-BOTH	3.	26	22.4	22.4	78.4
NO	5.	25	21.6	21.6	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.293

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR006 WHAT IS NATURE OF ASSISTANCE.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	4	3.4	4.5	4.5
SEMINARS,MEETINGS	1.	10	8.6	11.4	15.9
CENTER COORDINATOR	2.	17	14.7	19.3	35.2
DIR OF STU TEACHING	3.	42	36.2	47.7	83.0
TEACHERS	4.	2	1.7	2.3	85.2
DEPT SUPERVISOR	5.	2	1.7	2.3	87.5
NOT HELPFUL	6.	2	1.7	2.3	89.8
OTHER	7.	9	7.8	10.2	100.0
NO ON PREVIOUS Q.	8.	25	21.6	MISSING	100.0
YES,NOT SPECIFIED	9.	3	2.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.989

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 88
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 28

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR007 HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE IS STUDENT TEACHER.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	.9	.9
EXTREMELY	1.	36	31.0	31.0	31.9
SOMEWHAT	2.	61	52.6	52.6	84.5
NEUTRAL	3.	14	12.1	12.1	96.6
NOT VERY	4.	2	1.7	1.7	98.3
NOT AT ALL	5.	2	1.7	1.7	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.879

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR008 HOW DOES STUDENT TEACHER RELATE TO KIDS.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	.9	.9
EXTREMELY WELL	1.	50	43.1	43.1	44.0
FAIRLY WELL	2.	40	34.5	34.5	78.4
NEUTRAL	3.	15	12.9	12.9	91.4
NOT VERY WELL	4.	6	5.2	5.2	96.6
NOT RELATE AT ALL	5.	4	3.4	3.4	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.888

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR009 HOW DOES STUD. TEACH. RELATE TO ADULTS.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	.9	.9
EXTREMELY WELL	1.	57	49.1	49.1	50.0
FAIRLY WELL	2.	40	34.5	34.5	84.5
NEUTRAL	3.	14	12.1	12.1	96.6
NOT VERY WELL	4.	1	.9	.9	97.4
NOT RELATE AT ALL	5.	3	2.6	2.6	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.707

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR010 HOW MANY STUD. TEACH. RESPONSIBLE FOR.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
ONE	1.	91	78.4	82.0	82.0
TWO	2.	12	10.3	10.8	92.8
THREE	3.	2	1.7	1.8	94.6
FOUR	4.	3	2.6	2.7	97.3
SIX	6.	1	.9	.9	98.2
SEVEN	7.	1	.9	.9	99.1
GREATER THAN 7	8.	1	.9	.9	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	2	1.7	MISSING	100.0
NONE	9.	3	2.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.387

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 111
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 5

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR011 TRAINING SESSIONS FOR TEACHERS.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
YES-COLLEGE	3.	17	14.7	77.3	77.3
YES-SCHOOL	4.	2	1.7	9.1	86.4
YES-BOTH	5.	3	2.6	13.6	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	MISSING	100.0
NO	1.	93	80.2	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.364

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 22
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 94

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR012 RESPONSE TO SUGGESTED CHANGES

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
TOO EARLY TO TELL	2.	7	6.0	13.5	13.5
IGNORED,NO RESPONSE	3.	15	12.9	28.8	42.3
NOT IMPLEMENTED	4.	8	6.9	15.4	57.7
FAVORABLY RECEIVED	5.	14	12.1	26.9	84.6
IMPLEMENTED	6.	7	6.0	13.5	98.1
OTHER	7.	1	.9	1.9	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	3	2.6	MISSING	100.0
NONE SUGGESTED	1.	54	46.6	MISSING	100.0
NO RESPONSE STATED	9.	7	6.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 4.038

VALID OBSERVATIONS - 52
MISSING OBSERVATIONS - 64

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NORDLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR013 WHAT CHANGES DESIRED.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
MORE FLD EXPERIENCES	1.	34	29.3	41.5	41.5
LONGER STU TEACHING	2.	15	12.9	18.3	59.8
MORE HELP FROM UNIV	3.	18	15.5	22.0	81.7
LET SCHOOLS DO MORE	4.	2	1.7	2.4	84.1
ASSESS SKILLS FIRST	5.	5	4.3	6.1	90.2
MORE LESSON PLAN TNG	6.	3	2.6	3.7	93.9
CAREFUL PLACEMENT	7.	3	2.6	3.7	97.6
LIGHTEN S.T. CLASSES	8.	2	1.7	2.4	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	26	22.4	MISSING	100.0
OK AS IS	9.	8	6.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.512

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 82
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 34

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR014 IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR RURAL SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
VERY WELL PREPARED	1.	24	20.7	24.5	24.5
SOMEWHAT PREPARED	2.	33	28.4	33.7	58.2
NEUTRAL	3.	20	17.2	20.4	78.6
SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED	4.	12	10.3	12.2	90.8
NOT AT ALL PREPARED	5.	9	7.8	9.2	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	18	15.5	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.480

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 98
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 18

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR015

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
VERY WELL PREPARED	1.	56	48.3	49.1	49.1
SOMEWHAT PREPARED	2.	31	26.7	27.2	76.3
NEUTRAL	3.	15	12.9	13.2	89.5
SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED	4.	7	6.0	6.1	95.6
NOT AT ALL PREPARED	5.	5	4.3	4.4	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	2	1.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.895

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 114
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 2

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR016 IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR URBAN SCHOOL.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
VERY WELL PREPARED	1.	39	33.6	36.8	36.8
SOMEWHAT PREPARED	2.	33	28.4	31.1	67.9
NEUTRAL	3.	20	17.2	18.9	86.8
SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED	4.	8	6.9	7.5	94.3
NOT AT ALL PREPARED	5.	6	5.2	5.7	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	10	8.6	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.142

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 106
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 10

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR017 IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR INNER CITY.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
VERY WELL PREPARED	1.	13	11.2	13.1	13.1
SOMEWHAT PREPARED	2.	14	12.1	14.1	27.3
NEUTRAL	3.	37	31.9	37.4	64.6
SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED	4.	14	12.1	14.1	78.8
NOT AT ALL PREPARED	5.	21	18.1	21.2	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	17	14.7	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.162

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 99
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 17

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR018 EXPECTATIONS OF YOU CLEAR AT START.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	9	7.8	7.8	7.8
NO	1.	28	24.1	24.1	31.9
YES	2.	78	67.2	67.2	99.1
BOTH	3.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.612

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR019 HOW ARE EXPECTATIONS OF YOU DETERMINED.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	4	3.4	3.4	3.4
JOINTLY	1.	80	69.0	69.0	72.4
PRIMARILY SCHOOL	2.	13	11.2	11.2	83.6
PRIMARILY COLLEGE	3.	19	16.4	16.4	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.405

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR020 HOW ARE YOU COMPENSATED.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	3	2.6	2.6	2.6
CASH STIPEND	1.	38	32.8	32.8	35.3
LESS THAN $50	2.	3	2.6	2.6	37.9
NOT COMPENSATED	3.	6	5.2	5.2	43.1
$50 OR MORE	4.	24	20.7	20.7	63.8
FREE COURSES	6.	29	25.0	25.0	88.8
COURSES AND STIPEND	7.	2	1.7	1.7	90.5
OTHER	8.	3	2.6	2.6	93.1
DONT KNOW	9.	8	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.810

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR021 HOW WELL WAS STUD. PREPARED AT START.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
VERY WELL PREPARED	1.	46	39.7	40.0	40.0
SOMEWHAT PREPARED	2.	27	23.3	23.5	63.5
NEUTRAL	3.	26	22.4	22.6	86.1
SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED	4.	10	8.6	8.7	94.8
NOT AT ALL PREPARED	5.	6	5.2	5.2	100.0
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.157

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 115
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 1

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR022 PERCENT OF TIME SPENT TEACHING

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	11	9.5	9.5	9.5
90-100%	1.	5	4.3	4.3	13.8
80-89%	2.	10	8.6	8.6	22.4
70-79%	3.	20	17.2	17.2	39.7
60-69%	4.	17	14.7	14.7	54.3
50-59%	5.	18	15.5	15.5	69.8
40-49%	6.	7	6.0	6.0	75.9
30-39%	7.	5	4.3	4.3	80.2
BELOW 30%	8.	13	11.2	11.2	91.4
VARIES	9.	10	8.6	8.6	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 4.431

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR023 PERCENT TIME SPENT WITH STUDENT TEACHER

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	11	9.5	9.5	9.5
71-100%	1.	3	2.6	2.6	12.1
61-70%	2.	1	.9	.9	12.9
51-60%	3.	5	4.3	4.3	17.2
41-50%	4.	2	1.7	1.7	19.0
31-40%	5.	12	10.3	10.3	29.3
21-30%	6.	17	14.7	14.7	44.0
11-20%	7.	33	28.4	28.4	72.4
0-10%	8.	19	16.4	16.4	88.8
VARIES	9.	13	11.2	11.2	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 5.948

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR024 PERCENT TIME ON OTHER DUTIES

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	11	9.5	9.5	9.5
51-60%	3.	3	2.6	2.6	12.1
41-50%	4.	4	3.4	3.4	15.5
31-40%	5.	5	4.3	4.3	19.8
21-30%	6.	19	16.4	16.4	36.2
11-20%	7.	27	23.3	23.3	59.5
0-10%	8.	33	28.4	28.4	87.9
VARIES	9.	14	12.1	12.1	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 6.405

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR025 HOW MANY YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	.9	.9
LESS THAN YEAR	2.	2	1.7	1.7	2.6
1 YEAR	3.	3	2.6	2.6	5.2
2-3 YEARS	4.	12	10.3	10.3	15.5
4-5 YEARS	5.	22	19.0	19.0	34.5
6-10 YEARS	6.	40	34.5	34.5	69.0
11-15 YEARS	7.	22	19.0	19.0	87.9
16-20 YEARS	8.	7	6.0	6.0	94.0
MORE THAN 20 YEARS	9.	7	6.0	6.0	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 5.897

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR026 YEARS WORKED WITH STUDENT TEACHERS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	4	3.4	3.4	3.4
ZERO	1.	19	16.4	16.4	19.8
LESS THAN YEAR	2.	8	6.9	6.9	26.7
1 YEAR	3.	16	13.8	13.8	40.5
2-3 YEARS	4.	34	29.3	29.3	69.8
4-5 YEARS	5.	20	17.2	17.2	87.1
6-10 YEARS	6.	11	9.5	9.5	96.6
11-15 YEARS	7.	3	2.6	2.6	99.1
16-20 YEARS	8.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.569

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR027 HOW MANY STUDENTS WORKED WITH.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	1	.9	.9	.9
NO STUDENT TEACHERS	1.	11	9.5	9.5	10.3
1 STUDENT TEACHER	2.	17	14.7	14.7	25.0
2-3	3.	30	25.9	25.9	50.9
4-5	4.	24	20.7	20.7	71.6
6-10	5.	22	19.0	19.0	90.5
11-15	6.	7	6.0	6.0	96.6
16-20	7.	1	.9	.9	97.4
21-49	8.	2	1.7	1.7	99.1
OVER 49	9.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.578

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR028 HOW HAS EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY CHANGED,

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	19	16.4	16.4	16.4
NONE,NOT MUCH	1.	53	45.7	45.7	62.1
SLIGHTLY,SOME	2.	6	5.2	5.2	67.2
YES,UNSPECIFIED	3.	2	1.7	1.7	69.0
BY WORK WITH S.T.	4.	10	8.6	8.6	77.6
BROADENED	5.	14	12.1	12.1	89.7
REALIZE POOR ED CRS	6.	3	2.6	2.6	92.2
MISPLACED TEACHERS	7.	1	.9	.9	93.1
OTHER	9.	8	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.397

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR029 HAVE SET SCHEDULE OF EXPERIENCES FOR ST.

69

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	3	2.6	2.6	2.6
NO	1.	46	39.7	39.7	42.2
YES	2.	60	51.7	51.7	94.0
VARIES WITH STUDENT	3.	7	6.0	6.0	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.612

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR030 WHAT ARE YOU NOT PREPARED FOR.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	36	31.0	31.0	31.0
NONE	1.	24	20.7	20.7	51.7
PHYS,EMOTION PROB	2.	3	2.6	2.6	54.3
SEMINARS,UNIV.	3.	5	4.3	4.3	58.6
EVALUATION	4.	7	6.0	6.0	64.7
DISCIPLINE	5.	4	3.4	3.4	68.1
UNQUALIFIED S.T.-S	6.	11	9.5	9.5	77.6
INNOVATION	7.	4	3.4	3.4	81.0
ADVISING	8.	10	8.6	8.6	89.7
OTHER	9.	12	10.3	10.3	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.233

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR031 MOST EFFECTIVE CONTRIB. OF UNIV..

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER,DONT KNOW	0.	35	30.2	30.2	30.2
TRAINING FOR COOP T.	1.	31	26.7	26.7	56.9
FREE TUITION	2.	3	2.6	2.6	59.5
GRADUATE CREDIT	3.	4	3.4	3.4	62.9
BETTER PRE S.T EXP	4.	11	9.5	9.5	72.4
IN-SERVICE	5.	12	10.3	10.3	82.8
PLANNING HELP	6.	7	6.0	6.0	88.8
PHIL OF ED FOR S.T.	7.	2	1.7	1.7	90.5
PREPARE FOR DUTIES	8.	3	2.6	2.6	93.1
OTHER	9.	8	6.9	6.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.629

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR032 AGE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	6	5.2	5.2	5.2
20-24 YEARS OLD	1.	14	12.1	12.1	17.2
25-29	2.	37	31.9	31.9	49.1
30-34	3.	23	19.8	19.8	69.0
35-39	4.	10	8.6	8.6	77.6
40-44	5.	10	8.6	8.6	86.2
45-49	6.	7	6.0	6.0	92.2
50-54	7.	8	6.9	6.9	99.1
OVER54	8.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.043

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR033 TYPE OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	2	1.7	1.7	1.7
RURAL	1.	12	10.3	10.3	12.1
SUBURBAN	2.	45	38.8	38.8	50.9
URBAN	3.	39	33.6	33.6	84.5
INNER CITY	4.	3	2.6	2.6	87.1
URBAN&SUBURBAN	5.	11	9.5	9.5	96.6
INNER CITY&SUBURBAN	6.	3	2.6	2.6	99.1
INNER CITY&URBAN	7.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.681

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR034 KIND OF SCHOOL ATTENDED

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	3	2.6	2.6	2.6
PUBLIC	1.	57	49.1	49.1	51.7
PRIVATE,PAROCHIAL	2.	47	40.5	40.5	92.2
BOTH	3.	9	7.8	7.8	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.534

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR035 KIND OF SCHOOL TEACHING IN

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	2	1.7	1.7	1.7
SUBURBAN	2.	86	74.1	74.1	75.9
URBAN	3.	23	19.8	19.8	95.7
INNER CITY	4.	2	1.7	1.7	97.4
URBAN&SUBURBAN	5.	2	1.7	1.7	99.1
INNER CITY&URBAN	7.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.293

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR036 IS SCHOOL PUBLIC.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	3	2.6	2.6	2.6
PUBLIC	1.	75	64.7	64.7	67.2
PRIVATE,PAROCHIAL	2.	37	31.9	31.9	99.1
	4.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 1.319

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR037 ENROLLMENT

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	4	3.4	3.4	3.4
LESS THAN 250	1.	4	3.4	3.4	6.9
251-500	2.	21	18.1	18.1	25.0
501-750	3.	35	30.2	30.2	55.2
751-1000	4.	17	14.7	14.7	69.8
1001-1500	5.	14	12.1	12.1	81.9
1501-2000	6.	6	5.2	5.2	87.1
OVER 2000	7.	15	12.9	12.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 3.707

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR038 COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - UNDERGRADUATE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	14	12.1	12.1	12.1
BALDWIN-WALLACE	1.	3	2.6	2.6	14.7
CASE WESTERN RESERVE	2.	7	6.0	6.0	20.7
CLEVELAND STATE	3.	9	7.8	7.8	28.4
JOHN CARROLL	5.	5	4.3	4.3	32.8
ST. JOHN COLLEGE	7.	24	20.7	20.7	53.4
OTHER	9.	54	46.6	46.6	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 6.233

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR039 COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - GRADUATE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	37	31.9	31.9	31.9
BALDWIN-WALLACE	1.	1	.9	.9	32.8
CASE WESTERN RESERVE	2.	9	7.8	7.8	40.5
CLEVELAND STATE	3.	10	8.6	8.6	49.1
JOHN CARROLL	5.	8	6.9	6.9	56.0
ST. JOHN COLLEGE	7.	16	13.8	13.8	69.8
OTHER	9.	35	30.2	30.2	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 4.448

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

FILE QUESTI (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
SUBFILE SHAKER KIRK PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT JFK TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS
ARLING GILGLE NOROLM STJOHN

VARIABLE VAR040 LEVEL OF STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
NO ANSWER	0.	4	3.4	3.4	3.4
GRADES K-3	1.	38	32.8	32.8	36.2
4-6	2.	18	15.5	15.5	51.7
7-9	3.	15	12.9	12.9	64.7
10-12	4.	18	15.5	15.5	80.2
K-6	5.	8	6.9	6.9	87.1
7-12	6.	8	6.9	6.9	94.0
1-12	7.	6	5.2	5.2	99.1
OTHER	8.	1	.9	.9	100.0
	TOTAL	116	100.0	100.0	100.0

STATISTICS..

MEAN 2.836

VALID OBSERVATIONS = 116
MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 0

ERIC

APPENDIX C

TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO

THE

STUDENT TEACHERS SURVEY - SPRING 1972

Conducted By The

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS COORDINATING COMMITTEE

As part of the SITE Project

Funded by a Grant from the

MARTHA HOLDEN JENNINGS FOUNDATION

In March of 1972 the Teacher Education Centers Coordinating Committee conducted a questionnaire study of student teachers and cooperating teachers from teacher education centers operating in the Greater Cleveland area. Verbatim responses are available in a separate report. This report presents the tabulation of responses from student teachers. Responses from cooperating teachers are available in a separate report.

METRO AREA TOTALS

Cleveland Commission on Higher Education
Cleveland, Ohio

April, 1972

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES001 HOW YOU FELT ABOUT S.T. EXPERIENCE.

L	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
	0.	2	2.1	2.1	2.1
DISLIKED	1.	1	1.1	1.1	3.2
SOMEWHAT	2.	1	1.1	1.1	4.3
	3.	4	4.3	4.3	8.5
EWHAT	4.	24	25.5	25.5	34.0
LIKED	5.	62	66.0	66.0	100.0
	TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

..

4.479

SERVATIONS = 94
SERVATIONS = 0

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLIN(
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES003 WHAT YOU PARTICULARLY DISLIKED ABOUT S.T

EL

	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
	0.	13	13.8	13.8	13.8
	1.	7	7.4	7.4	21.3
LESSON PLAN	2.	13	13.8	13.8	35.1
STU ATITUDE	3.	9	9.6	9.6	44.7
MNAR,OBSERV	4.	11	11.7	11.7	56.4
TIME PROB.	5.	8	8.5	8.5	64.9
H GUIDANCE	6.	9	9.6	9.6	74.5
H FREEDOM	7.	5	5.3	5.3	79.8
TED	8.	8	8.5	8.5	88.3
	9.	11	11.7	11.7	100.0
	TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

S..

4.213

BSERVATIONS = 94
BSERVATIONS = 0

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES004 DID YOU ATTEND SEMINARS HELD BY COLLEGE.

VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
1.	93	98.9	98.9	98.9
2.	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

EL

1,011

SERVATIONS = 94
SERVATIONS = 0

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES04B WHO CONDUCTED THE SEMINARS.

VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
2.	72	76.6	77.4	77.4
3.	15	16.0	16.1	93.5
4.	4	4.3	4.3	97.8
6.	2	2.1	2.2	100.0
0.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
1.	0	.0	MISSING	100.0
TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

2,333

93
1

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES04C ABLE TO SHARE EXPERIENCES WITH S.T.

L

VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
2.	21	22.3	22.6	22.6
3.	47	50.0	50.5	73.1
4.	25	26.6	26.9	100.0
0.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
1.	0	0	MISSING	100.0
TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

ILY
RATELY
AT ALL
ES.4 IS NO
SPECIFIED

..

3.043

SERVATIONS = 93
SERVATIONS = 1

D COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES04D HOW USEFUL WERE SEMINARS.

BEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
Y USEFUL	2.	6	6.4	6.5	6.5
USEFUL	3.	56	59.6	60.2	66.7
LL USEFUL	4.	31	33.0	33.3	100.0
QUES.4 IS NO	0.	1	1.1	MISSING	100.0
OT SPECIFIED	1.	0	.0	MISSING	100.0
	TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

CS..

3.269

OBSERVATIONS = 93
OBSERVATIONS = 1

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE 1

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES05A HOW HELPFUL IS YOUR COOPERATING TEACHER.

EL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
HELPFUL	1.	68	72.3	72.3	72.3
HELPFUL	2.	15	16.0	16.0	88.3
	3.	7	7.4	7.4	95.7
HELPFUL	4.	3	3.2	3.2	98.9
L HELPFUL	5.	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

S..

1.447

BSERVATIONS = 94
BSERVATIONS = 0

D COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLINC
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES05B HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER IN TEACHING.

BEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
R	0.	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Y COMPETENT	1.	71	75.5	75.5	76.6
COMPETENT	2.	12	12.8	12.8	89.4
	3.	8	8.5	8.5	97.9
COMPETENT	4.	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
LL COMPETENT	5.	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

CS..

1,362

OBSERVATIONS = 94
OBSERVATIONS = 0

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES05C HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER WITH YOU?

BEL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
COMPETENT	1.	65	69.1	69.1	69.1
COMPETENT	2.	17	18.1	18.1	87.2
	3.	8	8.5	8.5	95.7
COMPETENT	4.	1	1.1	1.1	96.8
L COMPETENT	5.	3	3.2	3.2	100.0
	TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

S..

1,511

BSERVATIONS = 94
BSERVATIONS = 0

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES006 WHO EVALUATES YOUR WORK AS S.T.

EL	VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
ERSON	1.	10	10.6	10.6	10.6
RSON	2.	29	30.9	30.9	41.5
	3.	52	55.3	55.3	96.8
ACHING TEAM	4.	3	3.2	3.2	100.0
	TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

S..

2,511

BSERVATIONS = 94
BSERVATIONS = 0

STUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES007 HOW MANY REGULAR TEACHERS HELP YOU.

VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
0.	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
1.	40	42.6	42.6	43.6
2.	31	33.0	33.0	76.6
3.	16	17.0	17.0	93.6
4.	6	6.4	6.4	100.0
TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

1,851

SERVATIONS = 94
SERVATIONS = 0

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION 24 MAY PAGE

TUDEN (CREATION DATE = 24 MAY) TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
SHAKER PROSPE MENTOR CLEVHT TAYLOR HAWKEN BMS SOUTH ARLING
NOROLM STJOHN

QUES08A OTHERS EXPECTATIONS CLEAR BEFORE S.T.

VALUE	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (PERCENT)	CUMULATIVE ADJ FREQ (PERCENT)
0.	2	2.1	2.1	2.1
1.	67	71.3	71.3	73.4
2.	25	26.6	26.6	100.0
TOTAL	94	100.0	100.0	100.0

L

1,245

SERVATIONS = 94
SERVATIONS = 0

(Continuation of)
17. If you could change the system what would it be?

I would suggest spending full days out at school for a shorter period of time rather than the extending semester half day program.

The disappointments I feel with student teaching are solely due to the inadequacies of the school system in general--over-worked teachers; atmosphere of suspicion between teachers and students.

Have more changes made so curriculum wouldn't have to be followed so exactly.

More independence.

No student teaching after 10 years of teaching.

More useful seminar -- full semester Student Teaching.

I would change it from a traditional school to a Pod school.

It was difficult to prepare lesson plans 24 hours in advance. It was unfair that some teachers demanded this and others didn't.

A more creative academic atmosphere for the child--also much more individual study.

I would like students at this college to have more than 6 weeks for student teaching. Next year they'll spend 10 weeks in student teaching.

Experience with not only self contained classrooms but with team teaching-open classroom, etc.

Lengthen student teaching.
Include experiences observing and if possible, teaching a wider range of grades.
Experiences in non-graded and team teaching situation.

I'd change the monetary setup. Right now, we pay the university $1300 so that we can teach. I'd like to know where it goes.

26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

I think I've realized what a great responsibility it is to be a good teacher and how time-consuming it is.

Yes, I've learned a teacher has to learn to let a lot of things "slide off her back."

A teacher is many different personalities and professions rolled into one.

There is a lot more extra work than just teaching. I spent a lot of money on extra materials for classes.

I relize how difficult it is to prepare lessons and to stimulate classes.

Teachers have more responsibility than I thought.

I feel as if there's a larger responsibility on my shoulders. Fortunately since I really wanted to teach and still do, that added "responsibility" is welcomed and anticipated.

Teachers do not practice what they preach. "Stick" kids in double-bind situations.

A teacher plays many roles. For example: disciplinarian, policeman, housekeeper, manager, mother, psychologist, etc. I didn't realize what a great responsibility it really calls for.

The individual initiative of the teacher seems to determine the effectiveness of her teaching. It is a very time consuming job and I find that some teachers really cheating in amount of time spent in preparation.

High school students had idea that all teachers are old and mean. I'm not. They don't accept that (me). A teacher becomes more of a disciplinarian than I envisioned.

The student-teacher relationship has definitely changed.

More discipline and less actual teaching.

It involves a lot more training and more preparation than I had expected. There are many techniques to learn.

Some teachers do more than necessary but have fantastic classes and others do little work (which surprised me) and have very dull classes.

My idea of a teacher is not so idealic. Children have changed and sophisticated more than I remember..

I can understand a lot of frustrations I have seen before that I hadn't really understood. I can see that it's easy to get carried away on some big ego trip--and I think that a lot of people are.

I have less fear of controlling a class as far as discipline is concerned.

(Continuation of)
26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

Yes, they do more planning than I expected.

I realize the need for flexibility in a teacher.

I realize now how serious a responsibility a teacher really has to create a learning atmosphere in her room.

In methods classes we were always studying about the perfect, normal classroom, not so in reality.

Yes, more preparation is needed than I previously thought they did.

Education courses lead one to believe teachers are precision operating instructors--working with 4 teachers I realized that a good teacher does not assume the appearance of precision teacher.

I have realized how much I really want to teach.

Teachers have to alter their methods to cater to the whims of the principal.

Having more experiences in the basic thing that has helped; must learn to cope with all types of problems.

My concept has not been altered. I want to be a teacher even more now!

The amount of work involved and versatility necessary is more than I'd have imagined.

I never realized fully the great responsibility a teacher has and the influence she has on her students. Now I have a better understanding of this.

There seems to be more paper work involved than I before thought.

I realize more now than I did before that being a teacher is more than just getting across subject matter; it's a 24-hour job.

Teacher must be more prepared than I thought.

I am much more impressed with the demands and difficulties of being a good teacher.

Much more undisciplined here. No teacher dress code.

I realize that the teacher must be willing to give of herself completely.

Teacher must be prepared to meet and adapt to practical situations; ideal text book situations not real.

(Continuation of)
26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

Only in that the kids are less willing to learn and study than I expected.

Yes, a teacher also has to be a clerk -- you have much paperwork.

My concept of a teacher remains the same as before--a teacher's purpose is to help children to benefit from all the experiences our life has to offer.

I think that some teachers should have better rapport with their children. They don't seem to understand how children feel.

I thought it would be easier to establish a good student to teacher relationship.

The alteration has been on a personal level. Before student teaching I thought it would be too dull a career. Now I find it exciting.

I see now the wide diversity of skills, perceptions, sensitivities, and knowledge a teacher must have.

None! It is still a very important job, to my way of thinking, and I still think there are very few good ones. However, I now see specifically how difficult it is to be good!

I have found that it is not a job you can walk away from but one you take home with you.

I now see a teacher as much more than a teacher of a certain subject. She has many more jobs and needs to fulfill between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

I thought it would be a lot easier to be myself in the classroom, but the role of teacher (a distance largely created by grading and set curriculum) creates a barrier I hadn't expected.

A teacher must be more flexible.

Much more work than I realized if you wish to do a good job.

Her job is much more than subject matter. Her after class hours and her relationship with the children are very important.

I now realize the extreme importance of being a "real" person to children--taking interest in each individual and keeping the enthusiasm and encouragement level high.

There are many subtle ways a teacher should use her authority so as to get children to cooperate.

Yes, as one, you finally realize just how human teachers are.

31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

I am in the gifted program and I was told it was the closest place to my hometown.

No choice - The university put me here and I knew about the school and that I wouldn't mind being here.

I was placed there.

I feel that it was a challenge.

I wanted the opportunity of student teaching in a fairly structured type of classroom.

We had a choice between a pod school or a more traditional school. After observing the pod I knew it wasn't for me.

I thought, after observation, that the three teachers I worked under were the best I observed in the system.

Because I liked the faculty that was teaching there and the school was fairly close for six weeks of commuting.

I wanted to student teach and was given no choice as to place.

It's a nice school and the faculty seemed very nice.

Because I knew I had to student teach somewhere!

No real choice--assignment was late.

Teachers are friendly and work well together and with the principal. Children are interesting.

I was given a choice between a pod school or the more traditional type, which is where I am. I chose this because I felt much more secure in this type school.

It was conveniently located and had a good reputation as far as faculty-student rapport and very good cooperating teachers.

I wanted to teach--the particular shcool was not our choice.

It was a suburban school, with a good reputation. Also it is close to home.

Did not want other teaching site.

One does not have much choice. It was one of the few schools that the university uses for their science program.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Because of its flexibility in structure and new educational ideas and concepts which are actually put into practice.

Because I thought a Pod School would be a challenge.

The school put me there.

Private academy appealed to me as offering both traditional and innovative teaching methods, smaller classes for greater student-teacher rapport.

I wanted to experience the open school situation--I had decided a long time ago that the "traditional" setting held little for either students or myself.

I agreed to student teach in this school because I had no other choice. However, I enjoyed being here.

Because I like the idea of an open school.

I thought it would give me a broader base of experience.

It was close to my home and the school system is a very good one.

It was where I lived at home and the system I attended. I was familiar with it.

Closest to home; new school; new equipment.

Because I like the idea of working in an open school.

It is an open-education system and I feel the experience will prepare for any teaching situation--I will be able to be more open in a closed-situation.

I liked the structure. The school routine is very flexible and changing classes is a great system.

I was not given the opportunity to agree to my being placed in this school.

Convenient location - near home. Other student teachers to work with.

I was forced to because of Kent--but this particular school within the system was great. I was able to do 1/2 day.

Since I do not drive it was for convenience, the location of the school, being near my home.

I have done two co-op jobs at the school and I really did enjoy working with the faculty.

I wanted to teach in a center and I knew this school was good.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Because it was the only school that the university approved of that had a majority black pupil population.

Intermediate grades were available and location was good.

Primarily because of good bus connections even though I did take 2 buses to get there. Also I was interested in the community the school is situated in.

Because I knew or was familiar with the school before. Also it had the grade level I was hoping to teach (grade 5).

Agreed because there was no other place I could have done student teaching.

I didn't care where I went, it was the first place on the list.

I had no choice.

School was close to where I lived; the grade I wanted was offered.

No choice.

A list of schools and grade levels was posted; we each put down 3 choices--first come, first served. I chose this school simply because I was unfamiliar with all the schools and a friend told me where this school was located.

Close to home and the neighborhood was similar to my own--same economic status.

It was the most convenient in terms of travel and time.

Grade level and location was suitable.

Because of location.

Knew it was a good school; also, no choice.

It was assigned to me!

Heard of the cooperating teacher.

It was the center for my major field.

Location.

It was the only school with an appropriate grade level that was offered and was still fairly close by.

All math student teachers from my university had to come to this school.

The school was close to my home and convenient to home.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Middle class suburban school; one in which I felt I could perform and learn effectively.

I was assigned there.

It was the closest to my home.

I had no choice--but I agreed because of the school's excellent reputation.

It is the school system closest to my home that is active in the student teaching program.

Because I wanted a public school either urban or suburban.

I had to student-teach to become certified.

I was not aware that I had any choice. All history teachers from CWRU teach in the Shaker system.

Was not given a choice.

I was given no choice.

Because of its convenience; and its philosophy of education.

Suburban type school for basic background and because of easy accessibility transportation wise.

I had done a semester of field work with these students and became interested in them, their problems, interests, and progression. A tough class; felt it would give me varied experiences.

I chose to student teach in a pod school because I desired the experience of working in this type of school.

My school was close to home and it was a student teaching center.

My university set up a center in the school system and it was supposed to be very helpful to work there.

I was educated in the traditional schools and I wanted to have an experience in the more progressive type school so as to be able to make intelligent comparisons between the two.

All those in English placed at this school. It's high reputation made it agreeable.

I like 1st Grade because I love the age group and enthusiasm of the children at that age.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

I wanted to teach while living at home.

Inner city experience.

Because I wanted a suburban school and it was close to my home. It also had the grade level I wanted.

I was assigned to the school. I only had a choice in the grade level.

It is my home parish.

I did not have a choice.

School administration and teachers willing to have and cooperate with student teachers.

Nice school, nice surrounding, ideal education situation.

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

I've never been in a pod school so I did not really know what to expect- it seemed like complete chaos until I was there a couple of weeks.

Somewhat. Kids are still kids and they forget things easily. However, more freedom is allowed now and it takes some getting used to.

I didn't know what it would be like.

No, the children had many more personal problems than I imagined.

Self-contained classrooms. More secure.

Yes, these three worked extremely well alone or together. This was not a pod school but a regular one using open ideas.

No, It was a much more wonderful experience than I thought it would be.

Yes--I went to a very similar school. The only difference is that is much richer--more facilities.

Very much so. Teaching environment is very good.

Expected more open to ideas.

Yes, altho I was awakened more to the wide variety of individuals and personalities a teacher encounters in her classroom. It's a real challenge!

On my experience I was very happy with my choice. Even the principal showed a real interest in my work.

I envisioned the students as much more radical and mature than they seem to be. The school policies are more liberal than I had thought.

No. Students no longer show the same respect they did when I went to school.

I really came into it not thinking about what it would be like, but rather being open to accept anything.

Yes, because whatever course a teacher decides to teach in his or her area he is permitted with any possible method.

At first I thought it to be confusing but ORGANIZATION is the key.

I had not a real idea.

Somewhat--A little more provincial than I thought.

Pretty much, although I am far more encouraged than I have ever been before. It's even better than I had hoped.

(Continuation of)
32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

I thought I could never stand in front of a class and control and teach at the same time, but I did.

It is better than I thought, the students receive a better education and the teachers work together.

Yes, I was exposed to 3 grade levels.

Yes, it turned out to be as good as I thought it would be--the school has modern techniques.

General students behavior is quite different than expected, attitude, language used etc.

It was more structured in subject areas.

The atmosphere is more relaxed than I thought a schools' would be which I really like.

I expected to feel more like a teacher, not like a student taking another college course.

Yes, lots of interaction with student teachers--share ideas--problems.

In Kindergarten at another school which was also an excellent experience. These schools were both what I expected.

The school is as I thought; a very cheery and cozy place. Everyone was very pleasant during my six weeks.

Yes because of my two co-op jobs. While on co-op, I worked in different classrooms helping the teachers and children.

Yes, it was a good school and all of the teachers were excellent.

The facilities are better than I'd have thought but other things are the same.

Tension of doing student teaching eased considerably after meeting the people with whom I was to be associated with.

Lack of professional conduct and downright un-Christian attitude on part of some teachers in a Catholic school.

Yes, it was on a departmental scheduling and I had experience, as a result of student teaching, of teaching in both a self-contained and departmental situation.

Yes--a lot of hard work that was extremely beneficial. A lot of flops that I learned by.

(Continuation of)
32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

As sophisticated, progressive, and heterogeneous as I expected.

No. It was much better than I anticipated.

Yes. It is very progressive in courses offered and disciplined classrooms.

Much better than I thought.

I was slightly familiar with the school beforehand. But it was much larger than I expected. Otherwise, it was like I thought it would be.

Kids are not as intelligent or motivated as I expected. However, they are far better behaved than I had anticipated.

Yes, it is as I thought it would be.

Pretty much, except the students are less motivated than I expected.

It was the same as teaching in all private schools where I have taught.

Yes, except the classes are very overcrowded.

I had no particular stereotyped ideas of what the school would be like.

The teachers were much more strict than I had expected.

Yes. All of the workers and families, and faculty work together for the good of the children.

Yes. Seeing growth and development and building trust and respect, has shown me the satisfactions I can hope for in the profession.

I liked the concept but the wasted time and lack of self-control of the children surprised me.

The system was very good and most of the people in it were willing to be of help.

Yes it was as I thought in an overall respect. Although the subject area of Math in which I am working is different. The program is rather structured, the approach and methods are rather similar regardless of subject material.

No. The alternative education programs are undermined by administration and staff.

I had pretty much the same idea.

Much nicer than I thought. More Cooperative.

(Continuation of)

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

Yes. In a lot of ways this traditional school is like the one I went to.

This school was very traditionally run.

Student teaching was a very positive and enriching experience.

Yes. A lot of work and not much free time.

No - better--I worked with small group instruction in language arts and math.

Basically. The Math Dept. is more organized and a closer knit group than I had expected.

It's much better than I thought it would be. The kids were actively involved in their school life which was afforded by the set-up of the system.

Not really--in a Lakewood school and middle-class area I expected the children to be more respectful of authority.

Everything I thought it was it was.

Yes it was as I thought it would be. The children responded nicely, the co-operating teacher helped when necessary.

33. Has your concept of kids changed? If YES, how?

See them now as less sophisticated, less aware of and decided about themselves than I had expected.

Very media oriented - want entertainment. Since saturated with video tapes, records, etc. - harder to reach.

I entered student teaching thinking that if I were fair and nice to the students they would treat me fairly also. But I found that they take advantage every chance they get.

I didn't realize how much children are different now than when I was that age.

I never really knew the social problems which they are involved in at such an early age and the friends they need.

I realize kids can learn in many ways and the lecture is probably the least effective.

Only confirmed my opinion that they need to be treated more respectfully, humanly, but also more firmly.

I still think that they are extremely creative and interesting people.

Children today seem to have far depper problems and interests than I remembered.

I realize that they have feelings and are also individuals capable of making their own choices.

I didn't realize how knowledgeable six and seven year olds are, nor how creative.

I have four of my own so I knew children well before coming into this experience.

I never realized how much they can achieve if they are given challenges. I also found their excitement and enthusiasm a very rewarding experience.

I never realized they were so disrespectful. I also never realized how enthusiastic and uninhibited they are in the classroom.

Kids have a very short attention span, and it is very difficult to keep them interested during a whole class period.

Kids are much more advanced and mature today. They also are very spoiled and demand things more.

Need a lot more help in "growing up".

(Continuation of)
33. Has your concept of kids changed? If YES, how?

These kids were very spoiled and they didn't appreciate some of the things that were prepared. This might be typical of many children but when I worked with inner-city children I got much more satisfaction from it.

They are more sophisticated. They know more. Just their idea of sex and the fact they know has changed.

Although kids today, I thought, might be more open to listen but don't seem to be. Just as closed as ever.

Just in the sense that I am amazed increasingly more each day at what "kids" can understand and handle academically.

I've found they are extremely easy to work with because they want to prove themselves and they want praise from their teacher.

I understand the way their minds work a little better now.

They are not as easy to handle as I first thought. The teacher must be forceful in order to get anything accomplished by students.

You can help most of them with friendship.

They are more verbal than I expected.

Kids will always be kids - maybe only growing more sophisticated at their ages.

The third graders I have and all of the children in the school seem more mature, in many ways, than I expected.

They are really capable of doing and learning so much more than I thought they could.

34. Has your concept of yourself changed? If YES, How?

My weaknesses have been laid wide open and my preference for 1 to 1 relationships has been made clearer.

I know now that I have the ability to do more than see and teach children day in and day out.

Positive!

I feel more qualified and confident.

I am sure I am a good teacher.

Through the experience of Student Teaching I have learned much about myself and have gained much confidence.

I now have more confidence in myself.

I am more confident of my teaching ability.

Now confident in my teaching experience.

More self-confident before a class--begin to realize more the role and person of a teacher.

I feel I am much more definite in the feelings I have on how I would run my classroom.

I have gained confidence in myself and have finally succeeded at something.

I am more confident that I have something to offer and can be competent.

In the respect, that now I know I can teach effectively instead of just thinking that I would be able to.

I thought I could be the strict disciplinarian and still be respected but I'm learning differently.

I wasn't sure if I had heart to follow through with a punishment threat--but I learned.

I've learned that I have to be more patient and stricter with some kids.

I never thought I would make it through student teaching but I did.

I have taken a second look at my past teaching experiences and have already tried to improve.

Though I am usually a more articulate person, I get very nervous in front of kids.

I feel I need more experience in teaching.

(Continuation of)
34. Has your concept of yourself changed? If YES, How?

I thought I could get along better with people (that I disagree with).

I can be more sensitive to others.

I realize I need to learn to acquire a little more patience concerning discipline. I also realize I will be a good teacher soon.

I feel less capable than I had thought I was.

I am now sure that I would really like to be a teacher.

I think I am more self confident.

I feel that I really have a lot to offer people, especially children and I feel more confident in myself.

Teaching is much more difficult and more of a challenge than what I realized. I found that I was weak in many areas. I thought I wouldn't be.

I have found I am more patient and creative than I realized.

I am sure now that the children respond to me as much as I had hoped they would.

I saw how important it was for me to be patient, challenging and really care about each individual. Only then did I find myself getting response for all children.

I find I have much more patience than I imagined. I also found that, other than content material, I was ill-prepared for this experience.

I realize that to become a good teacher takes effort, it comes naturally to only a few people. Others have to work at it, like me.

I've realized that I'm much more patient than I thought. Also that I need to be careful in not getting too personally involved with students.

A lot firmer than I thought I would be.

Teaching is constant learning and planning on my part in order to be successful.

I thought I had more patience and was more creative.

Expected to be much more difficult. Unfortunately I find myself trying to "win" kids--I have to find a balance.

43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

I don't understand the purpose behind this questionnaire. Could it be used to change certain deficiencies?

I would have preferred to answer this questionnaire after I had completed my student teaching experience.

Mine was a wonderful experience. I just wish that some of the younger student teachers had not had as bad experiences as they related to me. Perhaps more could be done through their years of training to acquaint them with children.

Much of this questionnaire is quite vague--I've indicated specific questions already.

It was okay. It seemed to be pretty thorough.

I would like to know what you're going to do with this data. I have a feeling it will get filed and forgotten.

Good--A learning experience for me.

I'm glad this questionnaire was handed out because altho I was very happy with my student teaching experience, I know that there are others who had many gripes and I'm glad that they have the chance to express them to someone who has enough authority to try and better the situation wherever it is necessary.

Some questions leave no middle ground. Scales are difficult because many questions have two sides--bad and good. To choose one answer is presenting wrong image.

Given too soon.

I hope that it evaluates what you want it to. Having a self-addressed, stamped envelope encouraged me to complete this questionnaire--Good idea.

Very reasonable questions in which one constantly contemplates during his teaching experiences.

Quite thorough and good.

Many questions are difficult to evaluate. It is hard to express many things.

I tend to look disparagingly on all surveys especially education ones altho I admit the necessity of improving education and I suppose this is an attempt to begin but quest. 17 seemed typical (of same)--come on that would take years and pages and much thought and discussion. Too often educators esp. those not teaching become too involved in fine theory and other hypothetical studies when in service practical application is most important.

(Continuation of)
43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

What will you change as a result of this?

Good, easy to answer. Did not have to labor over every question.

Some yes and no answers should be qualified as to the way the respondent is answering question--another alternative could be "sometimes".

Terms such as "kids" and "flunky" don't sound very good.

#17 what system? Some questions cannot be answered with a definite yes or no.

The questionnaire is well set up. The only questions which I had to reread was 43 c, d. Having one's mind on the present schools, the word attended reminded me of my own formal education.

Excellent idea, but what will be the end result of it?

On question 17, I wasn't sure whether you meant the system at the school I was teaching at or the system set-up at the college regarding student teaching.

Seems like questions that are important individually but when completed in a questionnaire defeat the purpose.

I am interested in results, I found many items (5, 9) difficult to answer with choices provided. Because our time is equally divided between two teachers and my responses would therefore be extremely different.

It is extremely vague and I would like to see the conclusions you draw.

Some questions are ambiguous.

I thought it was very easy to fill out.

Some items were hard to answer because of having 3 cooperating teachers rather than 1.

Some of your questions were vague--you should be a little more specific. If you really want to improve the quality of education on all levels you should spend more time interviewing teachers, student-teachers and students.

I appreciate any opportunity to reveal how inadequately prepared teachers are by the universities. My success has been because I am a parent and have had some experience with children and schools.

Many of the questions in this questionnaire are extremely vague. I left some blank because the question was not clear to me. Also because I am presently student teaching in an open classroom many of the questions didn't really apply to me. I would be interested in hearing some of the results!

(Continuation of)
43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

Due to the system of St. John some of these questions were difficult to answer, because the schools are usually suburban parochial.

I hope it helps to improve teacher training.

I thought the questionnaire was fairly well compiled and set up in a manner that makes answering as simple as possible.

More specific questions about critic teachers needed.

I hope you can find this information useful in some way!

I was happy to fill this out.

Some of the questions are difficult to answer. For example, number 32 was difficult.

I felt that my teaching experience was different than that of other student teachers in the same school in that I had taught as a full time teacher for three years prior to my student teaching experience.

Well-made and balanced questionnaire.

I feel some of the yes/no questions could have been stated to include a selection of (somewhat) or (sometimes).

Good idea if real effort is made to make some progressive changes in teacher education.

You didn't ask about pre-student teaching experience-i.e. block.
You did not ask for ways to improve seminars or methods courses or what was wrong.
Glad everything required short answers.
Please recommend to member colleges that they survey seniors after student teaching to get feedback about student teaching and methods courses.

APPENDIX F

Coordinator Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. How many student teachers are you responsible for per term? _____

2. How many cooperating teachers are you responsible for per term? _____

3. Have you had any course work, workshop or formal training on being a coordinator? () YES () NO
 If yes; How would you rate the usefulness of the training?
 () Extremely helpful
 () Somewhat helpful
 () Not at all helpful

4. What percentage of your time is spent on duties related to student teachers and/or cooperating teachers?
 () 0 - 20%
 () 20 - 40%
 () 40 - 60%
 () 60 - 80%
 () 80 -100%

5. Do you engage in any of the following teacher training activities?

	YES	NO
a. Teach any courses at a college or university	()	()
b. Plan the in-service programs in your school related to student teaching	()	()
c. Implement the in-service programs in your school related to student teaching	()	()
d. Hold seminars for student teachers	()	()
e. Hold seminars for cooperating teachers	()	()
f. Provide in-service training not related to student teaching	()	()

6. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system?
 () YES () NO If yes; What was the response?

7. What changes in the teacher preparation system, would you make if you could?

8. Is your supervisory work part of graduate studies or some other program for which you are not paid. () YES () NO If No, by whom are you paid for your services?
 College or universities _____%
 School District _____%

9. Do you assign student teachers to cooperating teachers?
 () YES () NO If not; Who does _____

10. Were others expectations of you made clear before you began?
 () YES () NO

11. Do the college or university and the school have a mechanism for cooperatively determining general policy?
 () YES () NO If yes; To what extent is it useful.
 () Extremely useful
 () Somewhat useful
 () Not at all useful

12. How were cooperating teachers chosen, and by whom? _____

13. Which colleges or universities send student teachers to you?

 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____

14. What one major thing could the colleges or universities do to help you be more effective in your job?

15. What one major thing could your school do to help you be more effective in your job?

16. What one major thing could you do to help you be more effective in your job?

17. What type of school are you involved with?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

18. Who makes the decisions about student teaching?

() Mainly by college or university?
() Mainly by school personnel?
() Shared approximately equally?
If shared describe how this is accomplished. _____

19. Does your school have a joint college or university/school district committee? () YES () NO

20. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

APPENDIX G

Questions for Cooperating Teachers

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. Were you aware beforehand that you would have a student teacher?
 () NO () YES
 If yes, how many weeks before? ____ weeks.

2. Have you had any coursework, workshop or formal training on being a supervising teacher?
 () YES () NO If yes; How would you rate the usefulness of the training?
 () Extremely helpful
 () Somewhat helpful
 () Not at all helpful

3. Did you ask for a student teacher?
 () YES () NO

4. Have you had a student teacher before?
 () NO () YES If yes; To what extent was your previous experience helpful?
 () Extremely helpful
 () Somewhat helpful
 () Not at all helpful

5. Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term?
 () YES () NO If yes; What is the source of such assistance?
 () College or University
 () School District
 What is the nature of this assistance? _____

6. How knowledgeable is your student teacher in subject matter?

Extremely Knowledgeable												Not at All Knowledgeable

7. How does your student teacher relate to kids?

Relates Extremely Well												Does Not Relate At All

8. How does your student teacher relate to adults?

Relates Extremely Well												Does Not Relate At All

9. For how many student teachers do you have direct responsibility? _____

10. Are there on-going training sessions for teachers who are working with student teachers?
() NO () YES If yes; Who are they conducted by?
() College or University
() School

11. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system?
() YES () NO If yes; What was the response?

12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

13. To what extent do you feel your student teacher is prepared to assume the functions of a teacher:

a. In a rural school?

Very well Prepared											Not at All Prepared

b. In a suburban school?

Very well Prepared											Not at All Prepared

c. In an urban school (other than inner city)?

Very well Prepared											Not at All Prepared

d. In an inner city school?

Very well Prepared											Not at All Prepared

14. Were others expectations of you regarding student teaching activities made clear before you began?
() YES () NO

15. How are the expectations of your behavior regarding student teaching activities determined?

() Jointly by School and College/University
() Primarily by School
() Primarily by College/University

16. How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?

17. Based on your observations of the student teacher, to what extent was the student teacher prepared professionally to begin student teaching?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

18. On the average, what percentage of your school day is spent on each of the following categories:

Percent of time teaching ____ %
Percent of time working with student teacher ___%
Percent of time on other duties & activities ___%

19. How many years of teaching experience do you have? _____

20. How many years of working with student teachers do you have? ____

21. How many student teachers have you worked with? _____

22. How has your philosophy of education been changed as a result of working with a student teacher? _____

23. Do you have a set schedule of experiences for the student teacher?
() YES () NO

24. What aspects of working with student teachers do you feel you are not prepared for? _____

25. What would be the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional? _____

26. Statistical data

a. Your age ____
b. Name of the school you are teaching in _____
c. How would you describe the elementary and secondary schools you attended?
() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city
d. Was the school you attended: () Public? () Private or Parochial?
e. What kind of school are you teaching in?
() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city
f. Is the school you are teaching in: () Public? () Private or Parochial?
g. What is the approximate pupil enrollment of your school? _____
h. For elementary only: How many teachers are in your school (not counting student teachers)? _____
For departmental structure only: How many teachers in your department? _____
i. For elementary only: How many student teachers in your school? _____
For departmental structure only: How many student teachers in your department? ____
j. What is your college or university?
Undergraduate: _____
Graduate: _____

k. Circle the grade level(s) of your student teaching experience.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

27. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

APPENDIX H

Student Teacher Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. Place an "X" in the one box which best indicates how much you liked or disliked your student teaching experience. The more you disliked it, the bigger the minus number you should give it. The more you liked it the bigger the plus number you should give it.

Definitely Disliked					Neutral					Definitely Liked
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

4. While doing your student teaching, did you attend seminars held by your college or university?

YES () NO () IF NO, GO TO Q. 5.

a. Where were they held?
() At student teaching site
() At college or university
() Other _____
write in

b. Who conducted the seminar?
() College or University Person
() School Person
() Other _____
write in

c. To what extent were you in the seminar able to share experiences with other student teachers?
() Heavily
() Moderately
() Not at all

d. How would you rate the usefulness of the seminars?
() Extremely helpful
() Somewhat helpful
() Not at all helpful

5. The following scales apply to the cooperating teacher you work with most:

a. How helpful is your cooperating teacher?

Extremely Helpful | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Helpful

b. How competent is your cooperating teacher in his/her own teaching?

Extremely Competent | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Competent

c. How competent is your cooperating teacher in working with you?

Extremely Competent | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Competent

6. Who is responsible for evaluating your work as a student teacher?

() College or University Person
() School Person
() Other _____
write in

7. How many regular teachers do you have helping you?

() one
() two
() three
() more than three

8. Were others expectations of you made clear before you began? () YES () NO
Are they clear now? () YES () NO

9. Do you feel that you are unfairly being used for your services while the school and university are unduly benefiting?

() YES () NO

10. In terms of the amount of responsibility you have, is it

() Too much responsibility?
() About right?
() Too little responsibility?

11. How do you feel about your student teaching experience?

As some sort of flunky | | | | | | | | | | | | As some sort of established teacher

12. Have you suggested changes in the student teacher system?
() YES () NO If yes, what was the response?

13. To what extent do you feel prepared to assume the functions of a teacher:

a. In a rural school?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

b. In a suburban school?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

c. In an urban school (other than inner city)?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

d. In an inner city school?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

14. Do you like kids now more or less than before student teaching?

() like kids a great deal more
() like kids somewhat more
() about the same
() like kids somewhat less
() like kids a great deal less

15. Do you like the thought of being a teacher now more or less than before student teaching?

() like thought a great deal more
() like thought somewhat more
() about the same
() like thought somewhat less
() like thought about the same

16. When you begin teaching, would you like to teach kids older or younger than the ones you experienced in student teaching?

() older
() about the same
() younger

17. If you could change the system what would it be?

18. What do you think your chances are for obtaining a teaching job?

() Extremely good
() Pretty good
() Only fair
() Pretty bad
() Extremely bad

19. How many credit hours of formal education courses have you had?

____ Semester hours
____ Quarter hours

20. Do you intend to teach after completing your program?
() YES () NO
If NO: Did your student teaching experience change your mind?
() YES () NO

21. Where would you prefer to teach?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

22. Did you choose to student teach where you are now?

() YES () NO

If No: What kind of school did you prefer?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

23. How helpful have your education courses been to you in practice?

Extremely Useful | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Useful

24. Does the content of your education courses have more meaning now?

() YES () NO

25. Are the schools as you thought they were?

() YES () NO

26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

27. To what extent do you <u>study</u> (as opposed to work with) other teachers?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

28. To what extent do you study (as opposed to work with) other grade levels?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

29. To what extent do you work with other teachers?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

30. To what extent do you work with other grade levels?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

33. Has your concept of kids changed?

() YES () NO

If YES, How?

34. Has your concept of yourself changed?

() YES () NO

If YES, How?

35. To what extent do you get cooperation and help from adults in the school other than your cooperating teacher? Others are:

() Extremely helpful
() Somewhat helpful
() Neutral
() Not very helpful
() Not at all helpful

36. How many weeks have you been student teaching? ____ weeks

37. How many weeks into the student term before you had complete charge of a class? ____ weeks

38. Do you feel reasonably competent in your content area? () YES () NO

What is your content area? _____

39. To what extent are you aware of resources available to you in your school?

() Extremely familiar
() Somewhat familiar
() Not at all familiar

40. To what extent are you aware of resources available in the community?

() Extremely familiar
() Somewhat familiar
() Not at all familiar

41. How much time do you spend in preparing for teaching per day? ____ hours

42. Are you expected to attend the staff meetings and other activities that your cooperating teacher is expected to be in?

() YES () NO

43. Statistical data

a. Your age ____
b. Name of the school you are student teaching in _____
c. How would you describe the elementary and secondary schools you attended?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

d. Was the school you attended () Public? () Private/Parochial?
e. What kind of school are you student teaching in?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

f. Is the school you are student teaching in: () Public
() Private/Parochial
g. What is the approximate pupil enrollment of your school _____
h. For elementary only: How many teachers in your school? _____
(not counting student teachers)
For departmental structure only: How many teachers in your department? _____
i. For elementary only: How many student teachers in your school? _____
For departmental structure only: How many student teachers in your department? ____
j. What is your college or university?

k. Circle the grade level(s) of your student teaching experience.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

l. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

APPENDIX I

COMPUTER PROGRAM

SPSS — COOPERATING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE —

```
  1. RUN NAME        CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
  2. FILE NAME       QUESTIONS FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS
  3. VARIABLE LIST   VAR001 TO VAR045
  4. INPUT MEDIUM    CARD
  5. SURFILE LIST    SHAKER,KIRK,PROSPECT,MENTOR,CLEVHTS,JFK,TAYLOR,HAWKEN,RMS,SOUTH,
  6.                 ARLING,GILGLEN,NOROLM,STJOHN
  7. # OF CASES      8,8,5,7,6,2,4,2,6,2,11,4,20,31

DEFINITE REPETITION, THE INPUT FORMAT PROVIDES FOR  45 VARIABLES.   45 WILL BE READ.
 FOR  1 RECORDS (-CARDS-) PER CASE.  A MAXIMUM OF   47 -COLUMNS- ARE USED ON A RECORD.

  8. INPUT FORMAT    FIXED(40F1.0,2F2.0,3F1.0)
  9. PRINT FORMATS   VAR001 TO VAR045 (0)
 10. VAR LABELS      VAR001,AWARE BEFORE WOULD HAVE STUDENT TEACHER./
 11.                 VAR002,IF TRAINED FOR SUPERVISOR--HOW HELPFUL./
 12.                 VAR003,ASK FOR STUDENT TEACHER./
 13.                 VAR004,IF HAD S.T.BEFORE WAS EXPERIENCE HELPFUL/
 14.                 VAR005,HAVE ASSISTANCE DURING TERM./
 15.                 VAR006,WHAT IS NATURE OF ASSISTANCE./
 16.                 VAR007,HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE IS STUDENT TEACHER./
 17.                 VAR008,HOW DOES STUDENT TEACHER RELATE TO KIDS./
 18.                 VAR009,HOW DOES STUD. TEACH. RELATE TO ADULTS./
 19.                 VAR010,HOW MANY STUD. TEACH. RESPONSIBLE FOR./
 20.                 VAR011,TRAINING SESSIONS FOR TEACHERS./
 21.                 VAR012,RESPONSE TO SUGGESTED CHANGES/
 22.                 VAR013,WHAT CHANGES DESIRED./
 23.                 VAR014,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR RURAL SCHOOL.
 24.                 VAR015,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR SUBURBAN SCHOOL./
 25.                 VAR016,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR URBAN SCHOOL./
 26.                 VAR017,IS STUDENT PREPARED FOR INNER CITY./
 27.                 VAR018,EXPECTATIONS OF YOU CLEAR AT START./
 28.                 VAR019,HOW ARE EXPECTATIONS OF YOU DETERMINED./
 29.                 VAR020,HOW ARE YOU COMPENSATED./
 30.                 VAR021,HOW WELL WAS STUD. PREPARED AT START./
 31.                 VAR022,PERCENT OF TIME SPENT TEACHING/
 32.                 VAR023,PERCENT TIME SPENT WITH STUDENT TEACHER/
 33.                 VAR024,PERCENT TIME ON OTHER DUTIES/
 34.                 VAR025,HOW MANY YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE./
 35.                 VAR026,YEARS WORKED WITH STUDENT TEACHERS/
 36.                 VAR027,HOW MANY STUDENTS WORKED WITH./
```

```
37.                 VAR028,HOW HAS EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY CHANGED./
38.                 VAR029,HAVE SET SCHEDULE OF EXPERIENCES FOR ST./
39.                 VAR030,WHAT ARE YOU NOT PREPARED FOR./
40.                 VAR031,MOST EFFECTIVE CONTRIB. OF UNIV../
41.                 VAR032,AGE/
42.                 VAR033,TYPE OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED/
43.                 VAR034,KIND OF SCHOOL ATTENDED/
44.                 VAR035,KIND OF SCHOOL TEACHING IN/
45.                 VAR036,IS SCHOOL PUBLIC./
46.                 VAR037,ENROLLMENT/
47.                 VAR038,COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - UNDERGRADUATE/
48.                 VAR039,COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY - GRADUATE/
49.                 VAR040,LEVEL OF STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE/
50.                 VAR041,SCHOOL CODE/
51.                 VAR042,CLUSTER CODE/
52.                 VAR043,ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY CODE/
53.                 VAR044,SIZE CODE/
54.                 VAR045,TYPE OF CENTER CODE/
55. VALUE LABELS    VAR001(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)WEEK OR LESS(3)2-3 WEEKS
56.                 (4)4-5(5)6-7(6)8-9(7)10-11(8)OVER 11(9)YES - NOT SPECIFIED/
57.                 VAR002,VAR004(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES, EXTREMELY
58.                 (3)YES, SOMEWHAT(4)YES, NOT AT ALL (5)YES, NOT SPECIFIED/
59.                 VAR003(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES/
60.                 VAR005(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES-COLLEGE OR UNIV.
61.                 (2)YES-SCHOOL DISTRICT(3)YES-BOTH(4)YES-UNSPECIFIED(5)NO/
62.                 VAR006,(0)NO ANSWER(1)SEMINARS,MEETINGS(2)CENTER COORDINATOR
63.                 (3)DIR OF STU TEACHING(4)TEACHERS(5)DEPT SUPERVISOR
64.                 (6)NOT HELPFUL(7)OTHER(8)NO ON PREVIOUS Q.
65.                 (9)YES,NOT SPECIFIED/
66.                 VAR007,(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY(2)SOMEWHAT(3)NEUTRAL
67.                 (4)NOT VERY(5)NOT AT ALL/
68.                 VAR008,VAR009(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY WELL(2)FAIRLY WELL
69.                 (3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY WELL(5)NOT RELATE AT ALL/
70.                 VAR010,(0)NO ANSWER(1)ONE(2)TWO(3)THREE(4)FOUR(5)FIVE
71.                 (6)SIX(7)SEVEN(8)GREATER THAN 7(9)NONE/
72.                 VAR011(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES-NOT SPECIFIED(3)YES-COLLEGE
73.                 (4)YES-SCHOOL(5)YES-BOTH/
74.                 VAR012,(0)NO ANSWER(1)NONE SUGGESTED(2)TOO EARLY TO TELL
75.                 (3)IGNORED,NO RESPONSE(4)NOT IMPLEMENTED(5)FAVORABLY RECEIVED
```

```
76.       (6)IMPLEMENTED(7)OTHER(9)NO RESPONSE STATED/
77.       VAR013,(0)NO ANSWER(1)MORE FLD EXPERIENCES(2)LONGER STU TEACHING
78.       (3)MORE HELP FROM UNIV(4)LET SCHOOLS DO MORE
79.       (5)ASSESS SKILLS FIRST(6)MORE LESSON PLAN TNG
80.       (7)CAREFUL PLACEMENT(8)LIGHTEN S.T. CLASSES(9)OK AS IS/
81.       VAR014 TO VAR017,VAR021(0)NO ANSWER(1)VERY WELL PREPARED
82.       (2)SOMEWHAT PREPARED(3)NEUTRAL(4)SOMEWHAT UNPREPARED
83.       (5)NOT AT ALL PREPARED/
84.       VAR018(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES(3)BOTH/
85.       VAR019(0)NO ANSWER(1)JOINTLY(2)PRIMARILY SCHOOL
86.       (3)PRIMARILY COLLEGE/
87.       VAR020(0)NO ANSWER(1)CASH,STIPEND(2)LESS THAN $50
88.       (3)NOT COMPENSATED(4)$50 OR MORE(5)VARIES(6)FREE COURSES
89.       (7)COURSES AND STIPEND(8)OTHER(9)DONT KNOW/
90.       VAR022(0)NO ANSWER(1)90-100%(2)80-89%(3)70-79%(4)60-69%
91.       (5)50-59%(6)40-49%(7)30-39%(8)BELOW 30%(9)VARIES/
92.       VAR023,VAR024(0)NO ANSWER(1)71-100%(2)61-70%(3)51-60%
93.       (4)41-50%(5)31-40%(6)21-30%(7)11-20%(8)0-10%(9)VARIES/
94.       VAR025,VAR026(0)NO ANSWER(1)ZERO(2)LESS THAN YEAR(3)1 YEAR
95.       (4)2-3 YEARS(5)4-5 YEARS(6)6-10 YEARS(7)11-15 YEARS
96.       (8)16-20 YEARS(9)MORE THAN 20 YEARS/
97.       VAR027(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO STUDENT TEACHERS(2)1 STUDENT TEACHER
98.       (3)2-3(4)4-5(5)6-10(6)11-15(7)16-20(8)21-49(9)OVER 49/
99.       VAR028,(0)NO ANSWER(1)NONE,NOT MUCH(2)SLIGHTLY,SOME
100.      (3)YES,UNSPECIFIED(4)BY WORK WITH S.T.(5)BROADENED
101.      (6)REALIZE POOR ED CRS(7)MISPLACED TEACHERS(9)OTHER/
102.      VAR029(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES(3)VARIES WITH STUDENT/
103.      VAR030(0)NO ANSWER(1)NONE(2)PHYS,EMOTION PROB(3)SEMINARS,UNIV.
104.      (4)EVALUATION(5)DISCIPLINE(6)UNQUALIFIED S.T.-S(7)INNOVATION
105.      (8)ADVISING(9)OTHER/
106.      VAR031,(0)NO ANSWER,DONT KNOW(1)TRAINING FOR COOP T.
107.      (2)FREE TUITION(3)GRADUATE CREDIT(4)BETTER PRE S.T EXP
108.      (5)IN-SERVICE(6)PLANNING HELP(7)PHIL OF ED FOR S.T.
109.      (8)PREPARE FOR DUTIES(9)OTHER/
110.      VAR032(0)NO ANSWER(1)20-24 YEARS OLD(2)25-29(3)30-34(4)35-39
111.      (5)40-44(6)45-49(7)50-54(8)OVER54/
112.      VAR033,VAR035(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL(2)SUBURBAN(3)URBAN
113.      (4)INNER CITY(5)URBAN&SUBURBAN(6)INNER CITY&SUBURBAN
114.      (7)INNER CITY&URBAN/
```

```
115.                    VAR034,VAR036(0)NO ANSWER(1)PUBLIC(2)PRIVATE,PAROCHIAL(3)BOTH/
116.                    VAR037(0)NO ANSWER(1)LESS THAN 250(2)251-500(3)501-750
117.                    (4)751-1000(5)1001-1500(6)1501-2000(7)OVER 2000/
118.                    VAR038,VAR039(0)NO ANSWER(1)BALDWIN-WALLACE
119.                    (2)CASE WESTERN RESERVE(3)CLEVELAND STATE(4)CUY COM COLLEGE
120.                    (5)JOHN CARROLL(6)NOTRE DAME(7) ST. JOHN COLLEGE (8)URSULINE
121.                    (9)OTHER/
122.                    VAR040,(0)NO ANSWER(1)GRADES K-3(2)4-6(3)7-9(4)10-12(5)K-6
123.                    (6)7-12(7)1-12(8)OTHER/
124. MISSING VALUES     VAR001(0,1)/VAR006(8,9)/VAR010(0,9)/VAR011(0,1)/
125.                    VAR012(0,1,9)/VAR013(0,9)/VAR014 TO VAR017,VAR021(0)
126. PROCESS SBFILESEACH
127. CODEBOOK           VAR001 TO VAR040
128. STATISTICS         1
129. READ INPUT DATA
     (DATA FILE)
130. PROCESS SBFILESALL
131. CODEBOOK           VAR001 TO VAR040
132. STATISTICS         1
133. FINISH
```

APPENDIX J

COMPUTER PROGRAM

SPSS STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

```
 1. RUN NAME        CLEVELAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
 2. FILE NAME       STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION
 3. VARIABLE LIST   QUES001,QUES002,QUES003,QUES004,QUES04A,QUES04B,QUES04C,
 4.                 QUES04D,QUES05A,QUES05B,QUES05C,QUES006,QUES007,QUES08A,
 5.                 QUES08B,QUES009,QUES010,QUES011,QUES012,QUES13A,QUES13B,
 6.                 QUES13C,QUES13D,QUES014,QUES015,QUES016,QUES017,QUES018,
 7.                 QUES019,QUES020,QUES021,QUES022,QUES023,QUES024,QUES025,
 8.                 QUES026,QUES027,QUES028,QUES029,QUES030,QUES031,QUES032,
 9.                 QUES033,QUES034,QUES035,QUES036,QUES037,QUES38A,QUES38B,
10.                 QUES039,QUES040,QUES041,QUES042,QUES43A,QUES43C,
11.                 QUES43D,QUES43E,QUES43F,QUES43J,QUES43K,QUES43L,QUES43M,
12.                 QUES43N,QUES044
13. INPUT MEDIUM    CARD
14. SUBFILE LIST    SHAKER,PROSPECT,MENTOR,CLEVHTS,TAYLOR,HAWKEN,BMS,SOUTH,
15.                 ARLING,GILGLEN,NOROLM,STJOHN
16. # OF CASES      6,5,3,5,3,2,8,1,7,3,19,32

DEFINITE REPETITION, THE INPUT FORMAT PROVIDES FOR  64 VARIABLES.   64 WILL BE READ.
 FOR  1 RECORDS (-CARDS-) PER CASE.  A MAXIMUM OF   66 -COLUMNS- ARE USED ON A RECORD.

17. INPUT FORMAT    FIXED(60F1.0,2F2.0,2F1.0)
18. PRINT FORMAT    QUES001 TO QUES044 (0)
19. VAR LABELS      QUES001,HOW YOU FELT ABOUT S.T. EXPERIENCE./
20.                 QUES002,WHAT YOU PARTICULARLY LIKED ABOUT S.T./
21.                 QUES003,WHAT YOU PARTICULARLY DISLIKED ABOUT S.T/
22.                 QUES004,DID YOU ATTEND SEMINARS HELD BY COLLEGE./
23.                 QUES04A,WHERE WERE SEMINARS HELD./
24.                 QUES04B,WHO CONDUCTED THE SEMINARS./
25.                 QUES04C,ABLE TO SHARE EXPERIENCES WITH S.T./
26.                 QUES04D,HOW USEFUL WERE SEMINARS./
27.                 QUES05A,HOW HELPFUL IS YOUR COOPERATING TEACHER./
28.                 QUES05B,HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER IN TEACHING./
29.                 QUES05C,HOW COMPETENT COOP TEACHER WITH YOU./
30.                 QUES006,WHO EVALUATES YOUR WORK AS S.T./
31.                 QUES007,HOW MANY REGULAR TEACHERS HELP YOU./
32.                 QUES08A,OTHERS EXPECTATIONS CLEAR BEFORE S.T./
33.                 QUES08B,OTHERS EXPECTATIONS CLEAR NOW./
34.                 QUES009,UNFAIRLY USED FOR YOUR SERVICES./
35.                 QUES010,HOW MUCH RESPONSIBILITY DO YOU HAVE./
36.                 QUES011,HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT S.T. EXPERIENCE./
```

```
37.   QUES012,SUGGESTED CHANGES IN S.T. SYSTEM./
38.   QUES13A,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN RURAL SCHOOL./
39.   QUES13B,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN SUBURBAN SCHOOL/
40.   QUES13C,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN URBAN SCHOOL./
41.   QUES13D,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN INNER CITY./
42.   QUES014,LIKE KIDS MORE OR LESS THAN BEFORE S.T./
43.   QUES015,LIKE IDEA OF TEACHING MORE OR LESS NOW./
44.   QUES016,WANT AGE OF KIDS TO DIFFER THAN WHEN S.T/
45.   QUES017,WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE IN THE SYSTEM./
46.   QUES018,HOW ARE CHANCES OF GETTING TEACHING JOB./
47.   QUES019,HOW MANY EDUCATION CREDITS DO YOU HAVE./
48.   QUES020,INTEND TO TEACH AFTER COMPLETING PROGRAM/
49.   QUES021,WHERE WOULD YOU PREFER TO TEACH./
50.   QUES022,DID YOU CHOOSE TO S.T. WHERE YOU ARE NOW/
51.   QUES023,HOW USEFUL HAVE EDUCATION COURSES BEEN./
52.   QUES024,EDUCATION COURSES MORE MEANINGFUL NOW./
53.   QUES025,ARE THE SCHOOLS AS YOU THOUGHT THEY WERE/
54.   QUES026,CONCEPT OF TEACHER ALTERED--IF SO HOW./
55.   QUES027,EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER TEACHERS./
56.   QUES028,EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER GRADE LEVELS./
57.   QUES029,EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER TEACHERS./
58.   QUES030,EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER GRADE LEVELS./
59.   QUES031,WHY DID YOU AGREE TO S.T. IN THIS SCHOOL/
60.   QUES032,IS IT AS YOU THOUGHT--HOW SO OR HOW NOT./
61.   QUES033,HAS YOUR CONCEPT OF KIDS CHANGED--HOW./
62.   QUES034,YOUR CONCEPT OF YOURSELF CHANGED--HOW./
63.   QUES035,HOW HELPFUL ADULTS IN THE SCHOOL./
64.   QUES036,HOW MANY WEEKS HAVE YOU BEEN S.T./
65.   QUES037,WHEN DID YOU BECOME IN CHARGE OF A CLASS/
66.   QUES38A,ARE YOU COMPETENT IN YOUR CONTENT AREA./
67.   QUES38B,WHAT IS YOUR CONTENT AREA./
68.   QUES039,HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR SCHOOL./
69.   QUES040,HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR COMMUNITY/
70.   QUES041,HOW MUCH TEACHING PREPARATION PER DAY./
71.   QUES042,ATTEND MEETINGS THAT COOP TEACHER IS IN./
72.   QUES43A,YOUR AGE./
73.   QUES43C,ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED./
74.   QUES43D,ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED./
```

```
    QUES43F,KIND OF SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHING IN./
    QUES43J,YOUR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY./
    QUES43K,GRADE LEVEL OF S.T. EXPERIENCE./
    QUES43L,SCHOOL CODE./
    QUES43M,CENTER CODE./
    QUES43N,ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY CODE./
    QUES044,SIZE CODE./
VALUE LABELS  QUES001(0)NO ANSWER(1)DEFINITELY DISLIKED(2)DISLIKED--SOMEWHAT
    (3)NEUTRAL(4)LIKED--SOMEWHAT(5)DEFINITELY LIKED/
    QUES002(0)NO ANSWER(1)ALL OF IT(2)STUDENTS(3)CO-OPERATING TEACHER
    (4)WORK IN OPEN-SCHOOL(5)TEAM TEACHING(6)LEARN BY DOING
    (7)OBSERVING, TAPING(8)FREEDOM, CREATIVITY(9)OTHER/
    QUES003(0)NO ANSWER(1)NOTHING(2)DETAILED LESSON PLAN
    (3)DISIPLN, STU ATITUDE(4)METHOD,SEMNAR,OBSERV
    (5)SCHEDULE, TIME PROB.(6)NOT ENOUGH GUIDANCE
    (7)NOT ENOUGH FREEDOM(8)NOT ACCEPTED(9)OTHER/
    QUES004,QUES08A,QUES08B,QUES009,QUES024(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO/
    QUES025,QUES38A,QUES042(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO/
    QUES04A(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
    (2)S.T. SITE(3)COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY(4)BOTH(5)OTHER--NO WRITE IN
    (6)OTHER--PROFS HOME(7)OTHER--AREA SCHOOL(8)OTHER--COLLEGE, ETC./
    QUES04B(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
    (2)COLLEGE PERSON(3)SCHOOL PERSON(4)BOTH(5)OTHER--NO WRITE IN
    (6)BOTH, SPEC. SPEAKERS/
    QUES04C(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
    (2)SHARE HEAVILY(3)SHARE MODERATELY(4)SHARE NOT AT ALL/
    QUES04D(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
    (2)EXTREMELY USEFUL(3)SOMEWHAT USEFUL(4)NOT AT ALL USEFUL/
    QUES05A,QUES023,QUES035(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY HELPFUL
    (2)SOMEWHAT HELPFUL(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY HELPFUL
    (5)NOT AT ALL HELPFUL/
    QUES05B,QUES05C(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY COMPETENT
    (2)SOMEWHAT COMPETENT(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY COMPETENT
    (5)NOT AT ALL COMPETENT/
    QUES006(0)NO ANSWER(1)COLLEGE PERSON(2)SCHOOL PERSON(3)BOTH
    (4)OTHER--TEACHING TEAM/
    QUES007(0)NO ANSWER(1)ONE TEACHER(2)TWO TEACHERS(3)THREE TEACHERS
```

```
113.    (4)MORE THAN 3 TEACHERS/
114.    QUES010(0)NO ANSWER(1)TOO MUCH(2)ABOUT RIGHT(3)TOO LITTLE/
115.    QUES011(0)NO ANSWER(1)SOME SORT OF FLUNKY(2)NOT QUITE FLUNKY
116.    (3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT QUITE A TEACHER(5)ESTABLISHED TEACHER/
117.    QUES012(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO SUGGESTIONS MADE(2)TOO EARLY TO TELL
118.    (3)IGNORED, NO RESPONSE(4)REPLIED TO,NO ACTION
119.    (5)RECEPTIVE, FAVORABLE(6)IMPLEMENTED(9)YES--NOT SPECIFIED/
120.    QUES13A,QUES13B,QUES13C,QUES13D(0)NO ANSWER(1)VERY WELL PREPARED
121.    (2)SOMEWHAT PREPARED(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY PREPARED
122.    (5)NOT AT ALL PREPARED/
123.    QUES014,QUES015(0)NO ANSWER(1)LIKE MUCH MORE(2)LIKE SOMEWHAT MORE
124.    (3)LIKE ABOUT THE SAME(4)LIKE SOMEWHAT LESS(5)LIKE MUCH LESS/
125.    QUES016(0)NO ANSWER(1)TEACH OLDER KIDS(2)TEACH SAME AGE
126.    (3)TEACH YOUNGER KIDS(4)SAME AGE OR OLDER(5)SAME AGE OR YOUNGER/
127.    QUES017(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHANGE, TOO EARLY
128.    (2)IMPROVE FIELD EXPER.(3)MORE INDIVIDUALIZED(4)MORE FREEDOM
129.    (5)SOME PAY(6)A FULL TEACHING DAY(7)EASE L.P.PREPARATION
130.    (8)OTHER(9)NEED COMPLETE CHANGE/
131.    QUES018(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY GOOD(2)PRETTY GOOD(3)ONLY FAIR
132.    (4)PRETTY BAD(5)EXTREMELY BAD/
133.    QUES019(0)NO ANSWER(1)1-30 SEMESTER HRS(2)31-60 SEMESTER HRS
134.    (3)61-120 SEMESTER HRS(4)OVER 120 SEMESTER HR/
135.    QUES020(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES-INTEND TO TEACH
136.    (2)NO-S.T. CHANGED MIND(3)NO-ST DIDNT CHG MIND(4)UNDECIDED/
137.    QUES021(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL AREA(2)SUBURBAN AREA(3)URBAN AREA
138.    (4)INNER CITY AREA(5)ANY AREA(6)RURAL OR SUBURBAN
139.    (7)URBAN OR SUBURBAN(8)INNER C. OR SUBURBAN/
140.    QUES022(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO-PREFER RURAL
141.    (3)NO-PREFER SUBURBAN(4)NO-PREFER URBAN
142.    (5)NO-PREFER INNER CITY(6)NO-NOTHING SPECIFIED/
143.    QUES026(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)MORE DEMANDING(3)HARDER TO DISCIPLINE
144.    (4)STUDENT RAPPORT HARD(5)MORE RESPONSIBILITY
145.    (6)MORE EXCITING(7)COURSES UNREALISTIC(9)OTHER/
146.    QUES027,QUES028,QUES029,QUES030(0)NO ANSWER
147.    (1)VERY FREQUENTLY(2)FREQUENTLY(3)INFREQUENTLY
148.    (4)HARDLY EVER/
149.    QUES031(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHOICE(2)CONVENIENT, LIKED IT
150.    (3)IT WAS TRADITIONAL(4)WANTED OPEN SCHOOL
```

```
151.          (5)IT WAS PROGRESSIVE(6)WANTED PUBLIC SCHOOL
152.          (7)WANTED CHALLENGE(8)PRE-S.T. AT SCHOOL(9)OTHER/
153.          QUES032(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO PRECONCEIVED IDEA(2)YES
154.          (3)EVEN BETTER(4)YES-MORE FREEDOM
155.          (5)YES-BETTER EQUIPPED(6)NO(7)MORE STU. PROBLEMS
156.          (8)MORE STRUCTURED(9)OTHER/
157.          QUES033(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES, NOT SPECIFIED(3)GREAT ACHIEVERS
158.          (4)MORE MATURE(5)HARDER TO HANDLE(6)HARDER-KEEP INTEREST
159.          (7)LESS MATURE(8)NEED MORE RESPECT(9)OTHER/
160.          QUES034(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHANGE(2)YES, NOT SPECIFIED
161.          (3)FEEL MORE CONFIDENT(4)BETTER THAN REALIZED(5)IM LESS PREPARED
162.          (6)IMP. OF PATIENCE(7)AWARE IMP. OF CARING(8)AWARE MY WEAKNESSES
163.          (9)OTHER/
164.          QUES036,QUES037(0)NO ANSWER OR NONE(1)1-2 WEEKS
165.          (2)3-4 WEEKS(3)5-6 WEEKS(4)7-8 WEEKS(5)9-10 WEEKS
166.          (6)11-12 WEEKS(7)MORE THAN 12 WEEKS/
167.          QUES38B(0)NO ANSWER(1)SCIENCE(2)SOCIAL SCIENCE(3)MATH
168.          (4)HISTORY(5)ENGLISH(6)READING(7)OTHER(8)ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
169.          (9)SECONDARY EDUCATION/
170.          QUES039,QUES040(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY FAMILIAR
171.          (2)SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR(3)NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR/
172.          QUES041(0)NO ANSWER(1)LESS THAN 1 HOUR(2)1 HOUR
173.          (3)2 HOURS(4)3 HOURS(5)4 HOURS(6)5 HOURS(7)6-8 HOURS
174.          (8)9-10 HOURS(9)MORE THAN 10 HOURS/
175.          QUES43A(0)NO ANSWER(1)20-24 YEARS OLD(2)25-29 YEARS OLD
176.          (3)30-34 YEARS OLD(4)35-39 YEARS OLD(5)40-44 YEARS OLD
177.          (6)45-49 YEARS OLD(7)50-54 YEARS OLD(8)OVER 55 YEARS OLD/
178.          QUES43C,QUES43E(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL AREA(2)SUBURBAN AREA
179.          (3)URBAN AREA(4)INNER CITY AREA(5)URBAN & SUBURBAN
180.          (6)INNER CTY & SUBURBAN(7)INNER CITY & URBAN
181.          (8)RURAL & SUBURBAN(9)RURAL & URBAN/
182.          QUES43D,QUES43F(0)NO ANSWER(1)PUBLIC SCHOOL
183.          (2)PRIVATE, PAROCHIAL(3)BOTH/
184.          QUES43J(0)NO ANSWER(1)BALDWIN-WALLACE(2)CASE WESTERN RESERVE
185.          (3)CLEVELAND STATE(4)CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY(5)JOHN CARROLL
186.          (6)NOTRE DAME(7)ST. JOHN COLLEGE(8)URSULINE(9)OTHER/
```

```
187. MISSING VALUES QUES04A TO QUES04D,QUES012(0,1)
188. PROCESS SBFILESEACH
189. CODEBOOK        QUES001 TO QUES43K
190. STATISTICS      1
191. READ INPUT DATA

     (DATA_FILE)

192. PROCESS SBFILESALL
193. CODEBOOK        QUES001 TO QUES43K
194. STATISTICS      1
195. FINISH
```

APPENDIX K

DESCRIPTION OF THE STATISTICAL PACKAGE FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The questionnaire evaluation system described in this report uses a computerized approach to the tabulation of the student teacher and cooperating teacher questionnaires. Without a computerized approach, the task of preparing the tabulations for individual centers would be a very large task.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is a set of computer programs designed to simplify the tabulation of data of the type obtained through questionnaires.

The set of computer programs constituting SPSS can be found in most large computer facilities and many smaller ones particularly those associated with colleges and universities. The programs can be easily tailored to handle the results of a wide variety of questionnaires.

A variety of options are available including from a straight tabulation through crosstabulations and multivariate analyses. The option used to prepare the tabulations which appear in Appendices I and J is called CODEBOOK.

A manual which describes SPSS is available at computer facilities, at campus bookstores, or can be obtained from the publisher as shown below:

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
Norman Nie, Dale Bent, and C. Hull

McGraw Hill Book Company
330 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

(Continuation of)
17. If you could change the system what would it be?

I would suggest spending full days out at school for a shorter period of time rather than the extending semester half day program.

The disappointments I feel with student teaching are solely due to the inadequacies of the school system in general--over-worked teachers; atmosphere of suspicion between teachers and students.

Have more changes made so curriculum wouldn't have to be followed so exactly.

More independence.

No student teaching after 10 years of teaching.

More useful seminar -- full semester Student Teaching.

I would change it from a traditional school to a Pod school.

It was difficult to prepare lesson plans 24 hours in advance. It was unfair that some teachers demanded this and others didn't.

A more creative academic atmosphere for the child--also much more individual study.

I would like students at this college to have more than 6 weeks for student teaching. Next year they'll spend 10 weeks in student teaching.

Experience with not only self contained classrooms but with team teaching-open classroom, etc.

Lengthen student teaching.
Include experiences observing and if possible, teaching a wider range of grades.
Experiences in non-graded and team teaching situation.

I'd change the monetary setup. Right now, we pay the university $1300 so that we can teach. I'd like to know where it goes.

26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

I think I've realized what a great responsibility it is to be a good teacher and how time-consuming it is.

Yes, I've learned a teacher has to learn to let a lot of things "slide off her back."

A teacher is many different personalities and professions rolled into one.

There is a lot more extra work than just teaching. I spent a lot of money on extra materials for classes.

I relize how difficult it is to prepare lessons and to stimulate classes.

Teachers have more responsibility than I thought.

I feel as if there's a larger responsibility on my shoulders. Fortunately since I really wanted to teach and still do, that added "responsibility" is welcomed and anticipated.

Teachers do not practice what they preach. "Stick" kids in double-bind situations.

A teacher plays many roles. For example: disciplinarian, policeman, housekeeper, manager, mother, psychologist, etc. I didn't realize what a great responsibility it really calls for.

The individual initiative of the teacher seems to determine the effectiveness of her teaching. It is a very time consuming job and I find that some teachers really cheating in amount of time spent in preparation.

High school students had idea that all teachers are old and mean. I'm not. They don't accept that (me). A teacher becomes more of a disciplinarian than I envisioned.

The student-teacher relationship has definitely changed.

More discipline and less actual teaching.

It involves a lot more training and more preparation than I had expected. There are many techniques to learn.

Some teachers do more than necessary but have fantastic classes and others do little work (which surprised me) and have very dull classes.

My idea of a teacher is not so idealic. Children have changed and sophisticated more than I remember..

I can understand a lot of frustrations I have seen before that I hadn't really understood. I can see that it's easy to get carried away on some big ego trip--and I think that a lot of people are.

I have less fear of controlling a class as far as discipline is concerned.

(Continuation of)
26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

Yes, they do more planning than I expected.

I realize the need for flexibility in a teacher.

I realize now how serious a responsibility a teacher really has to create a learning atmosphere in her room.

In methods classes we were always studying about the perfect, normal classroom, not so in reality.

Yes, more preparation is needed than I previously thought they did.

Education courses lead one to believe teachers are precision operating instructors--working with 4 teachers I realized that a good teacher does not assume the appearance of precision teacher.

I have realized how much I really want to teach.

Teachers have to alter their methods to cater to the whims of the principal.

Having more experiences in the basic thing that has helped; must learn to cope with all types of problems.

My concept has not been altered. I want to be a teacher even more now!

The amount of work involved and versatility necessary is more than I'd have imagined.

I never realized fully the great responsibility a teacher has and the influence she has on her students. Now I have a better understanding of this.

There seems to be more paper work involved than I before thought.

I realize more now than I did before that being a teacher is more than just getting across subject matter; it's a 24-hour job.

Teacher must be more prepared than I thought.

I am much more impressed with the demands and difficulties of being a good teacher.

Much more undisciplined here. No teacher dress code.

I realize that the teacher must be willing to give of herself completely.

Teacher must be prepared to meet and adapt to practical situations; ideal text book situations not real.

(Continuation of)
26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

Only in that the kids are less willing to learn and study than I expected.

Yes, a teacher also has to be a clerk -- you have much paperwork.

My concept of a teacher remains the same as before--a teacher's purpose is to help children to benefit from all the experiences our life has to offer.

I think that some teachers should have better rapport with their children. They don't seem to understand how children feel.

I thought it would be easier to establish a good student to teacher relationship.

The alteration has been on a personal level. Before student teaching I thought it would be too dull a career. Now I find it exciting.

I see now the wide diversity of skills, perceptions, sensitivities, and knowledge a teacher must have.

None! It is still a very important job, to my way of thinking, and I still think there are very few good ones. However, I now see specifically how difficult it is to be good!

I have found that it is not a job you can walk away from but one you take home with you.

I now see a teacher as much more than a teacher of a certain subject. She has many more jobs and needs to fulfill between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

I thought it would be a lot easier to be myself in the classroom, but the role of teacher (a distance largely created by grading and set curriculum) creates a barrier I hadn't expected.

A teacher must be more flexible.

Much more work than I realized if you wish to do a good job.

Her job is much more than subject matter. Her after class hours and her relationship with the children are very important.

I now realize the extreme importance of being a "real" person to children--taking interest in each individual and keeping the enthusiasm and encouragement level high.

There are many subtle ways a teacher should use her authority so as to get children to cooperate.

Yes, as one, you finally realize just how human teachers are.

31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

I am in the gifted program and I was told it was the closest place to my hometown.

No choice - The university put me here and I knew about the school and that I wouldn't mind being here.

I was placed there.

I feel that it was a challenge.

I wanted the opportunity of student teaching in a fairly structured type of classroom.

We had a choice between a pod school or a more traditional school. After observing the pod I knew it wasn't for me.

I thought, after observation, that the three teachers I worked under were the best I observed in the system.

Because I liked the faculty that was teaching there and the school was fairly close for six weeks of commuting.

I wanted to student teach and was given no choice as to place.

It's a nice school and the faculty seemed very nice.

Because I knew I had to student teach somewhere!

No real choice--assignment was late.

Teachers are friendly and work well together and with the principal. Children are interesting.

I was given a choice between a pod school or the more traditional type, which is where I am. I chose this because I felt much more secure in this type school.

It was conveniently located and had a good reputation as far as faculty-student rapport and very good cooperating teachers.

I wanted to teach--the particular shcool was not our choice.

It was a suburban school, with a good reputation. Also it is close to home.

Did not want other teaching site.

One does not have much choice. It was one of the few schools that the university uses for their science program.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Because of its flexibility in structure and new educational ideas and concepts which are actually put into practice.

Because I thought a Pod School would be a challenge.

The school put me there.

Private academy appealed to me as offering both traditional and innovative teaching methods, smaller classes for greater student-teacher rapport.

I wanted to experience the open school situation--I had decided a long time ago that the "traditional" setting held little for either students or myself.

I agreed to student teach in this school because I had no other choice. However, I enjoyed being here.

Because I like the idea of an open school.

I thought it would give me a broader base of experience.

It was close to my home and the school system is a very good one.

It was where I lived at home and the system I attended. I was familiar with it.

Closest to home; new school; new equipment.

Because I like the idea of working in an open school.

It is an open-education system and I feel the experience will prepare for any teaching situation--I will be able to be more open in a closed-situation.

I liked the structure. The school routine is very flexible and changing classes is a great system.

I was not given the opportunity to agree to my being placed in this school.

Convenient location - near home. Other student teachers to work with.

I was forced to because of Kent--but this particular school within the system was great. I was able to do 1/2 day.

Since I do not drive it was for convenience, the location of the school, being near my home.

I have done two co-op jobs at the school and I really did enjoy working with the faculty.

I wanted to teach in a center and I knew this school was good.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Because it was the only school that the university approved of that had a majority black pupil population.

Intermediate grades were available and location was good.

Primarily because of good bus connections even though I did take 2 buses to get there. Also I was interested in the community the school is situated in.

Because I knew or was familiar with the school before. Also it had the grade level I was hoping to teach (grade 5).

Agreed because there was no other place I could have done student teaching.

I didn't care where I went, it was the first place on the list.

I had no choice.

School was close to where I lived; the grade I wanted was offered.

No choice.

A list of schools and grade levels was posted; we each put down 3 choices--first come, first served. I chose this school simply because I was unfamiliar with all the schools and a friend told me where this school was located.

Close to home and the neighborhood was similar to my own--same economic status.

It was the most convenient in terms of travel and time.

Grade level and location was suitable.

Because of location.

Knew it was a good school; also, no choice.

It was assigned to me!

Heard of the cooperating teacher.

It was the center for my major field.

Location.

It was the only school with an appropriate grade level that was offered and was still fairly close by.

All math student teachers from my university had to come to this school.

The school was close to my home and convenient to home.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

Middle class suburban school; one in which I felt I could perform and learn effectively.

I was assigned there.

It was the closest to my home.

I had no choice--but I agreed because of the school's excellent reputation.

It is the school system closest to my home that is active in the student teaching program.

Because I wanted a public school either urban or suburban.

I had to student-teach to become certified.

I was not aware that I had any choice. All history teachers from CWRU teach in the Shaker system.

Was not given a choice.

I was given no choice.

Because of its convenience; and its philosophy of education.

Suburban type school for basic background and because of easy accessibility transportation wise.

I had done a semester of field work with these students and became interested in them, their problems, interests, and progression. A tough class; felt it would give me varied experiences.

I chose to student teach in a pod school because I desired the experience of working in this type of school.

My school was close to home and it was a student teaching center.

My university set up a center in the school system and it was supposed to be very helpful to work there.

I was educated in the traditional schools and I wanted to have an experience in the more progressive type school so as to be able to make intelligent comparisons between the two.

All those in English placed at this school. It's high reputation made it agreeable.

I like 1st Grade because I love the age group and enthusiasm of the children at that age.

(Continuation of)
31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

I want to teach while living at home.

Inner city experience.

Because I wanted a suburban school and it was close to my home. It also had the grade level I wanted.

I was assigned to the school. I only had a choice in the grade level.

It is my home parish.

I did not have a choice.

School administration and teachers willing to have and cooperate with student teachers.

Nice school, nice surrounding, ideal education situation.

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

I've never been in a pod school so I did not really know what to expect- it seemed like complete chaos until I was there a couple of weeks.

Somewhat. Kids are still kids and they forget things easily. However, more freedom is allowed now and it takes some getting used to.

I didn't know what it would be like.

No, the children had many more personal problems than I imagined.

Self-contained classrooms. More secure.

Yes, these three worked extremely well alone or together. This was not a pod school but a regular one using open ideas.

No, It was a much more wonderful experience than I thought it would be.

Yes--I went to a very similar school. The only difference is that is much richer--more facilities.

Very much so. Teaching environment is very good.

Expected more open to ideas.

Yes, altho I was awakened more to the wide variety of individuals and personalities a teacher encounters in her classroom. It's a real challenge!

On my experience I was very happy with my choice. Even the principal showed a real interest in my work.

I envisioned the students as much more radical and mature than they seem to be. The school policies are more liberal than I had thought.

No. Students no longer show the same respect they did when I went to school.

I really came into it not thinking about what it would be like, but rather being open to accept anything.

Yes, because whatever course a teacher decides to teach in his or her area he is permitted with any possible method.

At first I thought it to be confusing but ORGANIZATION is the key.

I had not a real idea.

Somewhat--A little more provincial than I thought.

Pretty much, although I am far more encouraged than I have ever been before. It's even better than I had hoped.

(Continuation of)
32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

I thought I could never stand in front of a class and control and teach at the same time, but I did.

It is better than I thought, the students receive a better education and the teachers work together.

Yes, I was exposed to 3 grade levels.

Yes, it turned out to be as good as I thought it would be--the school has modern techniques.

General students behavior is quite different than expected, attitude, language used etc.

It was more structured in subject areas.

The atmosphere is more relaxed than I thought a schools' would be which I really like.

I expected to feel more like a teacher, not like a student taking another college course.

Yes, lots of interaction with student teachers--share ideas--problems.

In Kindergarten at another school which was also an excellent experience. These schools were both what I expected.

The school is as I thought; a very cheery and cozy place. Everyone was very pleasant during my six weeks.

Yes because of my two co-op jobs. While on co-op, I worked in different classrooms helping the teachers and children.

Yes, it was a good school and all of the teachers were excellent.

The facilities are better than I'd have thought but other things are the same.

Tension of doing student teaching eased considerably after meeting the people with whom I was to be associated with.

Lack of professional conduct and downright un-Christian attitude on part of some teachers in a Catholic school.

Yes, it was on a departmental scheduling and I had experience, as a result of student teaching, of teaching in both a self-contained and departmental situation.

Yes--a lot of hard work that was extremely beneficial. A lot of flops that I learned by.

(Continuation of)
32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

As sophisticated, progressive, and heterogeneous as I expected.

No. It was much better than I anticipated.

Yes. It is very progressive in courses offered and disciplined classrooms.

Much better than I thought.

I was slightly familiar with the school beforehand. But it was much larger than I expected. Otherwise, it was like I thought it would be.

Kids are not as intelligent or motivated as I expected. However, they are far better behaved than I had anticipated.

Yes, it is as I thought it would be.

Pretty much, except the students are less motivated than I expected.

It was the same as teaching in all private schools where I have taught.

Yes, except the classes are very overcrowded.

I had no particular stereotyped ideas of what the school would be like.

The teachers were much more strict than I had expected.

Yes. All of the workers and families, and faculty work together for the good of the children.

Yes. Seeing growth and development and building trust and respect, has shown me the satisfactions I can hope for in the profession.

I liked the concept but the wasted time and lack of self-control of the children surprised me.

The system was very good and most of the people in it were willing to be of help.

Yes it was as I thought in an overall respect. Although the subject area of Math in which I am working is different. The program is rather structured, the approach and methods are rather similar regardless of subject material.

No. The alternative education programs are undermined by administration and staff.

I had pretty much the same idea.

Much nicer than I thought. More Cooperative.

(Continuation of)

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

Yes. In a lot of ways this traditional school is like the one I went to.

This school was very traditionally run.

Student teaching was a very positive and enriching experience.

Yes. A lot of work and not much free time.

No - better--I worked with small group instruction in language arts and math.

Basically. The Math Dept. is more organized and a closer knit group than I had expected.

It's much better than I thought it would be. The kids were actively involved in their school life which was afforded by the set-up of the system.

Not really--in a Lakewood school and middle-class area I expected the children to be more respectful of authority.

Everything I thought it was it was.

Yes it was as I thought it would be. The children responded nicely, the co-operating teacher helped when necessary.

33. Has your concept of kids changed? If YES, how?

See them now as less sophisticated, less aware of and decided about themselves than I had expected.

Very media oriented - want entertainment. Since saturated with video tapes, records, etc. - harder to reach.

I entered student teaching thinking that if I were fair and nice to the students they would treat me fairly also. But I found that they take advantage every chance they get.

I didn't realize how much children are different now than when I was that age.

I never really knew the social problems which they are involved in at such an early age and the friends they need.

I realize kids can learn in many ways and the lecture is probably the least effective.

Only confirmed my opinion that they need to be treated more respectfully, humanly, but also more firmly.

I still think that they are extremely creative and interesting people.

Children today seem to have far depper problems and interests than I remembered.

I realize that they have feelings and are also individuals capable of making their own choices.

I didn't realize how knowledgeable six and seven year olds are, nor how creative.

I have four of my own so I knew children well before coming into this experience.

I never realized how much they can achieve if they are given challenges. I also found their excitement and enthusiasm a very rewarding experience.

I never realized they were so disrespectful. I also never realized how enthusiastic and uninhibited they are in the classroom.

Kids have a very short attention span, and it is very difficult to keep them interested during a whole class period.

Kids are much more advanced and mature today. They also are very spoiled and demand things more.

Need a lot more help in "growing up".

(Continuation of)
33. Has your concept of kids changed? If YES, how?

These kids were very spoiled and they didn't appreciate some of the things that were prepared. This might be typical of many children but when I worked with inner-city children I got much more satisfaction from it.

They are more sophisticated. They know more. Just their idea of sex and the fact they know has changed.

Although kids today, I thought, might be more open to listen but don't seem to be. Just as closed as ever.

Just in the sense that I am amazed increasingly more each day at what "kids" can understand and handle academically.

I've found they are extremely easy to work with because they want to prove themselves and they want praise from their teacher.

I understand the way their minds work a little better now.

They are not as easy to handle as I first thought. The teacher must be forceful in order to get anything accomplished by students.

You can help most of them with friendship.

They are more verbal than I expected.

Kids will always be kids - maybe only growing more sophisticated at their ages.

The third graders I have and all of the children in the school seem more mature, in many ways, than I expected.

They are really capable of doing and learning so much more than I thought they could.

34. Has your concept of yourself changed? If YES, How?

My weaknesses have been laid wide open and my preference for 1 to 1 relationships has been made clearer.

I know now that I have the ability to do more than see and teach children day in and day out.

Positive!

I feel more qualified and confident.

I am sure I am a good teacher.

Through the experience of Student Teaching I have learned much about myself and have gained much confidence.

I now have more confidence in myself.

I am more confident of my teaching ability.

Now confident in my teaching experience.

More self-confident before a class--begin to realize more the role and person of a teacher.

I feel I am much more definite in the feelings I have on how I would run my classroom.

I have gained confidence in myself and have finally succeeded at something.

I am more confident that I have something to offer and can be competent.

In the respect, that now I know I can teach effectively instead of just thinking that I would be able to.

I thought I could be the strict disciplinarian and still be respected but I'm learning differently.

I wasn't sure if I had heart to follow through with a punishment threat--but I learned.

I've learned that I have to be more patient and stricter with some kids.

I never thought I would make it through student teaching but I did.

I have taken a second look at my past teaching experiences and have already tried to improve.

Though I am usually a more articulate person, I get very nervous in front of kids.

I feel I need more experience in teaching.

(Continuation of)
34. Has your concept of yourself changed? If YES, How?

I thought I could get along better with people (that I disagree with).

I can be more sensitive to others.

I realize I need to learn to acquire a little more patience concerning discipline. I also realize I will be a good teacher soon.

I feel less capable than I had thought I was.

I am now sure that I would really like to be a teacher.

I think I am more self confident.

I feel that I really have a lot to offer people, especially children and I feel more confident in myself.

Teaching is much more difficult and more of a challenge than what I realized. I found that I was weak in many areas. I thought I wouldn't be.

I have found I am more patient and creative than I realized.

I am sure now that the children respond to me as much as I had hoped they would.

I saw how important it was for me to be patient, challenging and really care about each individual. Only then did I find myself getting response for all children.

I find I have much more patience than I imagined. I also found that, other than content material, I was ill-prepared for this experience.

I realize that to become a good teacher takes effort, it comes naturally to only a few people. Others have to work at it, like me.

I've realized that I'm much more patient than I thought. Also that I need to be careful in not getting too personally involved with students.

A lot firmer than I thought I would be.

Teaching is constant learning and planning on my part in order to be successful.

I thought I had more patience and was more creative.

Expected to be much more difficult. Unfortunately I find myself trying to "win" kids--I have to find a balance.

43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

I don't understand the purpose behind this questionnaire. Could it be used to change certain deficiencies?

I would have preferred to answer this questionnaire after I had completed my student teaching experience.

Mine was a wonderful experience. I just wish that some of the younger student teachers had not had as bad experiences as they related to me. Perhaps more could be done through their years of training to acquaint them with children.

Much of this questionnaire is quite vague--I've indicated specific questions already.

It was okay. It seemed to be pretty thorough.

I would like to know what you're going to do with this data. I have a feeling it will get filed and forgotten.

Good--A learning experience for me.

I'm glad this questionnaire was handed out because altho I was very happy with my student teaching experience, I know that there are others who had many gripes and I'm glad that they have the chance to express them to someone who has enough authority to try and better the situation wherever it is necessary.

Some questions leave no middle ground. Scales are difficult because many questions have two sides--bad and good. To choose one answer is presenting wrong image.

Given too soon.

I hope that it evaluates what you want it to. Having a self-addressed, stamped envelope encouraged me to complete this questionnaire--Good idea.

Very reasonable questions in which one constantly contemplates during his teaching experiences.

Quite thorough and good.

Many questions are difficult to evaluate. It is hard to express many things.

I tend to look disparagingly on all surveys especially education ones altho I admit the necessity of improving education and I suppose this is an attempt to begin but quest. 17 seemed typical (of same)--come on that would take years and pages and much thought and discussion. Too often educators esp. those not teaching become too involved in fine theory and other hypothetical studies when in service practical application is most important.

(Continuation of)
43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

What will you change as a result of this?

Good, easy to answer. Did not have to labor over every question.

Some yes and no answers should be qualified as to the way the respondent is answering question--another alternative could be "sometimes".

Terms such as "kids" and "flunky" don't sound very good.

#17 what system? Some questions cannot be answered with a definite yes or no.

The questionnaire is well set up. The only questions which I had to reread was 43 c, d. Having one's mind on the present schools, the word attended reminded me of my own formal education.

Excellent idea, but what will be the end result of it?

On question 17, I wasn't sure whether you meant the system at the school I was teaching at or the system set-up at the college regarding student teaching.

Seems like questions that are important individually but when completed in a questionnaire defeat the purpose.

I am interested in results, I found many items (5, 9) difficult to answer with choices provided. Because our time is equally divided between two teachers and my responses would therefore be extremely different.

It is extremely vague and I would like to see the conclusions you draw.

Some questions are ambiguous.

I thought it was very easy to fill out.

Some items were hard to answer because of having 3 cooperating teachers rather than 1.

Some of your questions were vague--you should be a little more specific. If you really want to improve the quality of education on all levels you should spend more time interviewing teachers, student-teachers and students.

I appreciate any opportunity to reveal how inadequately prepared teachers are by the universities. My success has been because I am a parent and have had some experience with children and schools.

Many of the questions in this questionnaire are extremely vague. I left some blank because the question was not clear to me. Also because I am presently student teaching in an open classroom many of the questions didn't really apply to me. I would be interested in hearing some of the results!

(Continuation of)
43. (1) Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

Due to the system of St. John some of these questions were difficult to answer, because the schools are usually suburban parochial.

I hope it helps to improve teacher training.

I thought the questionnaire was fairly well compiled and set up in a manner that makes answering as simple as possible.

More specific questions about critic teachers needed.

I hope you can find this information useful in some way!

I was happy to fill this out.

Some of the questions are difficult to answer. For example, number 32 was difficult.

I felt that my teaching experience was different than that of other student teachers in the same school in that I had taught as a full time teacher for three years prior to my student teaching experience.

Well-made and balanced questionnaire.

I feel some of the yes/no questions could have been stated to include a selection of (somewhat) or (sometimes).

Good idea if real effort is made to make some progressive changes in teacher education.

You didn't ask about pre-student teaching experience-i.e. block.
You did not ask for ways to improve seminars or methods courses or what was wrong.
Glad everything required short answers.
Please recommend to member colleges that they survey seniors after student teaching to get feedback about student teaching and methods courses.

APPENDIX F

Coordinator Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. How many student teachers are you responsible for per term? _____

2. How many cooperating teachers are you responsible for per term? _____

3. Have you had any course work, workshop or formal training on being a coordinator? () YES () NO
 If yes; How would you rate the usefulness of the training?
 () Extremely helpful
 () Somewhat helpful
 () Not at all helpful

4. What percentage of your time is spent on duties related to student teachers and/or cooperating teachers?
 () 0 - 20%
 () 20 - 40%
 () 40 - 60%
 () 60 - 80%
 () 80 -100%

5. Do you engage in any of the following teacher training activities?

	YES	NO
a. Teach any courses at a college or university	()	()
b. Plan the in-service programs in your school related to student teaching	()	()
c. Implement the in-service programs in your school related to student teaching	()	()
d. Hold seminars for student teachers	()	()
e. Hold seminars for cooperating teachers	()	()
f. Provide in-service training not related to student teaching	()	()

6. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system?
 () YES () NO If yes; What was the response?

7. What changes in the teacher preparation system, would you make if you could?

8. Is your supervisory work part of graduate studies or some other program for which you are not paid. () YES () NO If No, by whom are you paid for your services?
 College or universities _____%
 School District _____%

9. Do you assign student teachers to cooperating teachers?
 () YES () NO If not; Who does _____

10. Were others expectations of you made clear before you began?
 () YES () NO

11. Do the college or university and the school have a mechanism for cooperatively determining general policy?
 () YES () NO If yes; To what extent is it useful.
 () Extremely useful
 () Somewhat useful
 () Not at all useful

12. How were cooperating teachers chosen, and by whom? _____

13. Which colleges or universities send student teachers to you?

 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____

14. What one major thing could the colleges or universities do to help you be more effective in your job?

15. What one major thing could your school do to help you be more effective in your job?

16. What one major thing could you do to help you be more effective in your job?

17. What type of school are you involved with?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

18. Who makes the decisions about student teaching?

() Mainly by college or university?
() Mainly by school personnel?
() Shared approximately equally?
If shared describe how this is accomplished. _____

19. Does your school have a joint college or university/school district committee? () YES () NO

20. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

APPENDIX G

Questions for Cooperating Teachers

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. Were you aware beforehand that you would have a student teacher?
 () NO () YES
 If yes, how many weeks before? ____ weeks.

2. Have you had any coursework, workshop or formal training on being a supervising teacher?
 () YES () NO If yes; How would you rate the usefulness of the training?
 () Extremely helpful
 () Somewhat helpful
 () Not at all helpful

3. Did you ask for a student teacher?
 () YES () NO

4. Have you had a student teacher before?
 () NO () YES If yes; To what extent was your previous experience helpful?
 () Extremely helpful
 () Somewhat helpful
 () Not at all helpful

5. Do you have on-going assistance during the student teaching term?
 () YES () NO If yes; What is the source of such assistance?
 () College or University
 () School District
 What is the nature of this assistance? _____

6. How knowledgeable is your student teacher in subject matter?

Extremely Knowledgeable												Not at All Knowledgeable

7. How does your student teacher relate to kids?

Relates Extremely Well												Does Not Relate At All

8. How does your student teacher relate to adults?

Relates Extremely Well												Does Not Relate At All

9. For how many student teachers do you have direct responsibility? _____

10. Are there on-going training sessions for teachers who are working with student teachers?
() NO () YES If yes; Who are they conducted by?
() College or University
() School

11. Have you suggested changes in the teacher preparation system?
() YES () NO If yes; What was the response?

12. If you could change the teacher preparation system what would it be?

13. To what extent do you feel your student teacher is prepared to assume the functions of a teacher:

a. In a rural school?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

b. In a suburban school?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

c. In an urban school (other than inner city)?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

d. In an inner city school?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

14. Were others expectations of you regarding student teaching activities made clear before you began?
() YES () NO

15. How are the expectations of your behavior regarding student teaching activities determined?

() Jointly by School and College/University
() Primarily by School
() Primarily by College/University

16. How are you compensated for your work with student teachers?

17. Based on your observations of the student teacher, to what extent was the student teacher prepared professionally to begin student teaching?

Very well Prepared | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Prepared

18. On the average, what percentage of your school day is spent on each of the following categories:

Percent of time teaching ____ %
Percent of time working with student teacher ____ %
Percent of time on other duties & activities ____ %

19. How many years of teaching experience do you have? _____

20. How many years of working with student teachers do you have? ____

21. How many student teachers have you worked with? _____

22. How has your philosophy of education been changed as a result of working with a student teacher? _____

23. Do you have a set schedule of experiences for the student teacher?
() YES () NO

24. What aspects of working with student teachers do you feel you are not prepared for? _____

25. What would be the most effective contribution the universities could make to help you be a more effective professional? _____

26. Statistical data

a. Your age ____
b. Name of the school you are teaching in _____
c. How would you describe the elementary and secondary schools you attended?
 () Rural
 () Suburban
 () Urban (other than inner city)
 () Inner city
d. Was the school you attended: () Public? () Private or Parochial?
e. What kind of school are you teaching in?
 () Rural
 () Suburban
 () Urban (other than inner city)
 () Inner city
f. Is the school you are teaching in: () Public? () Private or Parochial?
g. What is the approximate pupil enrollment of your school? _____
h. For elementary only: How many teachers are in your school (not counting student teachers)? _____
 For departmental structure only: How many teachers in your department? _____
i. For elementary only: How many student teachers in your school? _____
 For departmental structure only: How many student teachers in your department? _____
j. What is your college or university?
 Undergraduate: _____
 Graduate: _____

k. Circle the grade level(s) of your student teaching experience.
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

27. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it. Include questions which should have been asked.

APPENDIX H

Student Teacher Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Complete as soon as possible after receipt and return to Questionnaire Project, Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1367 E. 6th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114.

1. Place an "X" in the one box which best indicates how much you liked or disliked your student teaching experience. The more you disliked it, the bigger the minus number you should give it. The more you liked it the bigger the plus number you should give it.

Definitely Disliked					Neutral					Definitely Liked
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

2. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly liked?

3. What was there about your student teaching experience that you particularly disliked?

4. While doing your student teaching, did you attend seminars held by your college or university?

YES () NO () IF NO, GO TO Q. 5.

a. Where were they held?
() At student teaching site
() At college or university
() Other _____ write in

b. Who conducted the seminar?
() College or University Person
() School Person
() Other _____ write in

c. To what extent were you in the seminar able to share experiences with other student teachers?
() Heavily
() Moderately
() Not at all

d. How would you rate the usefulness of the seminars?
() Extremely helpful
() Somewhat helpful
() Not at all helpful

5. The following scales apply to the cooperating teacher you work with most:

a. How helpful is your cooperating teacher?

Extremely Helpful | | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Helpful

b. How competent is your cooperating teacher in his/her own teaching?

Extremely Competent | | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Competent

c. How competent is your cooperating teacher in working with you?

Extremely Competent | | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Competent

6. Who is responsible for evaluating your work as a student teacher?

() College or University Person
() School Person
() Other _____
write in

7. How many regular teachers do you have helping you?

() one
() two
() three
() more than three

8. Were others expectations of you made clear before you began? () YES () NO
Are they clear now? () YES () NO

9. Do you feel that you are unfairly being used for your services while the school and university are unduly benefiting?

() YES () NO

10. In terms of the amount of responsibility you have, is it

() Too much responsibility?
() About right?
() Too little responsibility?

11. How do you feel about your student teaching experience?

As some sort of flunky												As some sort of established teacher

12. Have you suggested changes in the student teacher system?
() YES () NO If yes, what was the response?

13. To what extent do you feel prepared to assume the functions of a teacher:

a. In a rural school?

Very well Prepared												Not at All Prepared

b. In a suburban school?

Very well Prepared												Not at All Prepared

c. In an urban school (other than inner city)?

Very well Prepared												Not at All Prepared

d. In an inner city school?

Very well Prepared												Not at All Prepared

14. Do you like kids now more or less than before student teaching?

() like kids a great deal more
() like kids somewhat more
() about the same
() like kids somewhat less
() like kids a great deal less

15. Do you like the thought of being a teacher now more or less than before student teaching?

() like thought a great deal more
() like thought somewhat more
() about the same
() like thought somewhat less
() like thought about the same

16. When you begin teaching, would you like to teach kids older or younger than the ones you experienced in student teaching?

() older
() about the same
() younger

17. If you could change the system what would it be?

18. What do you think your chances are for obtaining a teaching job?

() Extremely good
() Pretty good
() Only fair
() Pretty bad
() Extremely bad

19. How many credit hours of formal education courses have you had?

____ Semester hours
____ Quarter hours

20. Do you intend to teach after completing your program?
() YES () NO
If NO: Did your student teaching experience change your mind?
() YES () NO

21. Where would you prefer to teach?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

22. Did you choose to student teach where you are now?

() YES () NO

If No: What kind of school did you prefer?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

23. How helpful have your education courses been to you in practice?

Extremely Useful | | | | | | | | | | | Not at All Useful

24. Does the content of your education courses have more meaning now?

() YES () NO

25. Are the schools as you thought they were?

() YES () NO

26. How has your concept of a teacher been altered? If so, how?

27. To what extent do you <u>study</u> (as opposed to work with) other teachers?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

28. To what extent do you study (as opposed to work with) other grade levels?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

29. To what extent do you work with other teachers?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

30. To what extent do you work with other grade levels?

() Very frequently
() Frequently
() Infrequently
() Hardly ever

31. Why did you select or agree to student teach in this school?

32. Is it as you thought? How so? How not?

33. Has your concept of kids changed?

() YES () NO

If YES, How?

34. Has your concept of yourself changed?

() YES () NO

If YES, How?

35. To what extent do you get cooperation and help from adults in the school other than your cooperating teacher? Others are:

() Extremely helpful
() Somewhat helpful
() Neutral
() Not very helpful
() Not at all helpful

36. How many weeks have you been student teaching? ____ weeks

37. How many weeks into the student term before you had complete charge of a class? ____ weeks

38. Do you feel reasonably competent in your content area? () YES () NO

What is your content area? _____

39. To what extent are you aware of resources available to you in your school?

() Extremely familiar
() Somewhat familiar
() Not at all familiar

40. To what extent are you aware of resources available in the community?

() Extremely familiar
() Somewhat familiar
() Not at all familiar

41. How much time do you spend in preparing for teaching per day? ____ hours

42. Are you expected to attend the staff meetings and other activities that your cooperating teacher is expected to be in?

() YES () NO

43. Statistical data

a. Your age ____
b. Name of the school you are student teaching in _____
c. How would you describe the elementary and secondary schools you attended?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

d. Was the school you attended () Public? () Private/Parochial?
e. What kind of school are you student teaching in?

() Rural
() Suburban
() Urban (other than inner city)
() Inner city

f. Is the school you are student teaching in: () Public
() Private/Parochial
g. What is the approximate pupil enrollment of your school _____
h. For elementary only: How many teachers in your school? _____
(not counting student teachers)
For departmental structure only: How many teachers in your department? _____
i. For elementary only: How many student teachers in your school? _____
For departmental structure only: How many student teachers in your department? _____
j. What is your college or university?

k. Circle the grade level(s) of your student teaching experience.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

l. Comments about this questionnaire or items on it.

```
37.   QUES012,SUGGESTED CHANGES IN S.T. SYSTEM./
38.   QUES13A,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN RURAL SCHOOL./
39.   QUES13B,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN SUBURBAN SCHOOL/
40.   QUES13C,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN URBAN SCHOOL./
41.   QUES13D,HOW PREPARED TO TEACH IN INNER CITY./
42.   QUES014,LIKE KIDS MORE OR LESS THAN BEFORE S.T./
43.   QUES015,LIKE IDEA OF TEACHING MORE OR LESS NOW./
44.   QUES016,WANT AGE OF KIDS TO DIFFER THAN WHEN S.T/
45.   QUES017,WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE IN THE SYSTEM./
46.   QUES018,HOW ARE CHANCES OF GETTING TEACHING JOB./
47.   QUES019,HOW MANY EDUCATION CREDITS OO YOU HAVE./
48.   QUES020,INTEND TO TEACH AFTER COMPLETING PROGRAM/
49.   QUES021,WHERE WOULD YOU PREFER TO TEACH./
50.   QUES022,DID YOU CHOOSE TO S.T. WHERE YOU ARE NOW/
51.   QUES023,HOW USEFUL HAVE EDUCATION COURSES BEEN./
52.   QUES024,EDUCATION COURSES MORE MEANINGFUL NOW./
53.   QUES025,ARE THE SCHOOLS AS YOU THOUGHT THEY WERE/
54.   QUES026,CONCEPT OF TEACHER ALTERED--IF SO HOW./
55.   QUES027,EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER TEACHERS./
56.   QUES028,EXTENT YOU STUDY OTHER GRADE LEVELS./
57.   QUES029,EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER TEACHERS./
58.   QUES030,EXTENT YOU WORK WITH OTHER GRADE LEVELS./
59.   QUES031,WHY DID YOU AGREE TO S.T. IN THIS SCHOOL/
60.   QUES032,IS IT AS YOU THOUGHT--HOW SO OR HOW NOT./
61.   QUES033,HAS YOUR CONCEPT OF KIDS CHANGED--HOW./
62.   QUES034,YOUR CONCEPT OF YOURSELF CHANGED--HOW./
63.   QUES035,HOW HELPFUL ADULTS IN THE SCHOOL./
64.   QUES036,HOW MANY WEEKS HAVE YOU BEEN S.T./
65.   QUES037,WHEN DID YOU BECOME IN CHARGE OF A CLASS/
66.   QUES38A,ARE YOU COMPETENT IN YOUR CONTENT AREA./
67.   QUES38B,WHAT IS YOUR CONTENT AREA./
68.   QUES039,HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR SCHOOL./
69.   QUES040,HOW AWARE OF RESOURCES IN YOUR COMMUNITY/
70.   QUES041,HOW MUCH TEACHING PREPARATION PER DAY./
71.   QUES042,ATTEND MEETINGS THAT COOP TEACHER IS IN./
72.   QUES43A,YOUR AGE./
73.   QUES43C,ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED./
74.   QUES43D,ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED./
```

```
76.                 QUES43F,KIND OF SCHOOL STUDENT TEACHING IN./
77.                 QUES43J,YOUR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY./
78.                 QUES43K,GRADE LEVEL OF S.T. EXPERIENCE./
79.                 QUES43L,SCHOOL CODE./
80.                 QUES43M,CENTER CODE./
81.                 QUES43N,ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY CODE./
82.                 QUES044,SIZE CODE./
83. VALUE LABELS    QUES001(0)NO ANSWER(1)DEFINITELY DISLIKED(2)DISLIKED--SOMEWHAT
84.                 (3)NEUTRAL(4)LIKED--SOMEWHAT(5)DEFINITELY LIKED/
85.                 QUES002(0)NO ANSWER(1)ALL OF IT(2)STUDENTS(3)CO-OPERATING TEACHER
86.                 (4)WORK IN OPEN-SCHOOL(5)TEAM TEACHING(6)LEARN BY DOING
87.                 (7)OBSERVING, TAPING(8)FREEDOM, CREATIVITY(9)OTHER/
88.                 QUES003(0)NO ANSWER(1)NOTHING(2)DETAILED LESSON PLAN
89.                 (3)DISIPLN, STU ATITUDE(4)METHOD,SEMNAR,OBSERV
90.                 (5)SCHEDULE, TIME PROB.(6)NOT ENOUGH GUIDANCE
91.                 (7)NOT ENOUGH FREEDOM(8)NOT ACCEPTED(9)OTHER/
92.                 QUES004,QUES08A,QUES08B,QUES009,QUES024(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO/
93.                 QUES025,QUES38A,QUES042(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO/
94.                 QUES04A(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
95.                 (2)S.T. SITE(3)COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY(4)BOTH(5)OTHER--NO WRITE IN
96.                 (6)OTHER--PROFS HOME(7)OTHER--AREA SCHOOL(8)OTHER--COLLEGE, ETC./
97.                 QUES04B(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
98.                 (2)COLLEGE PERSON(3)SCHOOL PERSON(4)BOTH(5)OTHER--NO WRITE IN
99.                 (6)BOTH, SPEC. SPEAKERS/
100.                QUES04C(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
101.                (2)SHARE HEAVILY(3)SHARE MODERATELY(4)SHARE NOT AT ALL/
102.                QUES04D(0)NO ANS--QUES.4 IS NO(1)ANSWER NOT SPECIFIED
103.                (2)EXTREMELY USEFUL(3)SOMEWHAT USEFUL(4)NOT AT ALL USEFUL/
104.                QUES05A,QUES023,QUES035(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY HELPFUL
105.                (2)SOMEWHAT HELPFUL(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY HELPFUL
106.                (5)NOT AT ALL HELPFUL/
107.                QUES05B,QUES05C(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY COMPETENT
108.                (2)SOMEWHAT COMPETENT(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY COMPETENT
109.                (5)NOT AT ALL COMPETENT/
110.                QUES006(0)NO ANSWER(1)COLLEGE PERSON(2)SCHOOL PERSON(3)BOTH
111.                (4)OTHER--TEACHING TEAM/
112.                QUES007(0)NO ANSWER(1)ONE TEACHER(2)TWO TEACHERS(3)THREE TEACHERS
```

```
113.      (4)MORE THAN 3 TEACHERS/
114.      QUES010(0)NO ANSWER(1)TOO MUCH(2)ABOUT RIGHT(3)TOO LITTLE/
115.      QUES011(0)NO ANSWER(1)SOME SORT OF FLUNKY(2)NOT QUITE FLUNKY
116.      (3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT QUITE A TEACHER(5)ESTABLISHED TEACHER/
117.      QUES012(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO SUGGESTIONS MADE(2)TOO EARLY TO TELL
118.      (3)IGNORED, NO RESPONSE(4)REPLIED TO,NO ACTION
119.      (5)RECEPTIVE, FAVORABLE(6)IMPLEMENTED(9)YES--NOT SPECIFIED/
120.      QUES13A,QUES13B,QUES13C,QUES13D(0)NO ANSWER(1)VERY WELL PREPARED
121.      (2)SOMEWHAT PREPARED(3)NEUTRAL(4)NOT VERY PREPARED
122.      (5)NOT AT ALL PREPARED/
123.      QUES014,QUES015(0)NO ANSWER(1)LIKE MUCH MORE(2)LIKE SOMEWHAT MORE
124.      (3)LIKE ABOUT THE SAME(4)LIKE SOMEWHAT LESS(5)LIKE MUCH LESS/
125.      QUES016(0)NO ANSWER(1)TEACH OLDER KIDS(2)TEACH SAME AGE
126.      (3)TEACH YOUNGER KIDS(4)SAME AGE OR OLDER(5)SAME AGE OR YOUNGER/
127.      QUES017(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHANGE. TOO EARLY
128.      (2)IMPROVE FIELD EXPER.(3)MORE INDIVIDUALIZED(4)MORE FREEDOM
129.      (5)SOME PAY(6)A FULL TEACHING DAY(7)EASE L.P.PREPARATION
130.      (8)OTHER(9)NEED COMPLETE CHANGE/
131.      QUES018(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY GOOD(2)PRETTY GOOD(3)ONLY FAIR
132.      (4)PRETTY BAD(5)EXTREMELY BAD/
133.      QUES019(0)NO ANSWER(1)1-30 SEMESTER HRS(2)31-60 SEMESTER HRS
134.      (3)61-120 SEMESTER HRS(4)OVER 120 SEMESTER HR/
135.      QUES020(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES-INTEND TO TEACH
136.      (2)NO-S.T. CHANGED MIND(3)NO-ST DIDNT CHG MIND(4)UNDECIDED/
137.      QUES021(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL AREA(2)SUBURBAN AREA(3)URBAN AREA
138.      (4)INNER CITY AREA(5)ANY AREA(6)RURAL OR SUBURBAN
139.      (7)URBAN OR SUBURBAN(8)INNER C. OR SUBURBAN/
140.      QUES022(0)NO ANSWER(1)YES(2)NO-PREFER RURAL
141.      (3)NO-PREFER SUBURBAN(4)NO-PREFER URBAN
142.      (5)NO-PREFER INNER CITY(6)NO-NOTHING SPECIFIED/
143.      QUES026(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)MORE DEMANDING(3)HARDER TO DISCIPLINE
144.      (4)STUDENT RAPPORT HARD(5)MORE RESPONSIBILITY
145.      (6)MORE EXCITING(7)COURSES UNREALISTIC(9)OTHER/
146.      QUES027,QUES028,QUES029,QUES030(0)NO ANSWER
147.      (1)VERY FREQUENTLY(2)FREQUENTLY(3)INFREQUENTLY
148.      (4)HARDLY EVER/
149.      QUES031(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHOICE(2)CONVENIENT, LIKED IT
150.      (3)IT WAS TRADITIONAL(4)WANTED OPEN SCHOOL
```

```
151.    (5)IT WAS PROGRESSIVE(6)WANTED PUBLIC SCHOOL
152.    (7)WANTED CHALLENGE(8)PRE-S.T. AT SCHOOL(9)OTHER/
153.    QUES032(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO PRECONCEIVED IDEA(2)YES
154.    (3)EVEN BETTER(4)YES-MORE FREEDOM
155.    (5)YES-BETTER EQUIPPED(6)NO(7)MORE STU. PROBLEMS
156.    (8)MORE STRUCTURED(9)OTHER/
157.    QUES033(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO(2)YES, NOT SPECIFIED(3)GREAT ACHIEVERS
158.    (4)MORE MATURE(5)HARDER TO HANDLE(6)HARDER-KEEP INTEREST
159.    (7)LESS MATURE(8)NEED MORE RESPECT(9)OTHER/
160.    QUES034(0)NO ANSWER(1)NO CHANGE(2)YES, NOT SPECIFIED
161.    (3)FEEL MORE CONFIDENT(4)BETTER THAN REALIZED(5)IM LESS PREPARED
162.    (6)IMP. OF PATIENCE(7)AWARE IMP. OF CARING(8)AWARE MY WEAKNESSES
163.    (9)OTHER/
164.    QUES036,QUES037(0)NO ANSWER OR NONE(1)1-2 WEEKS
165.    (2)3-4 WEEKS(3)5-6 WEEKS(4)7-8 WEEKS(5)9-10 WEEKS
166.    (6)11-12 WEEKS(7)MORE THAN 12 WEEKS/
167.    QUES38B(0)NO ANSWER(1)SCIENCE(2)SOCIAL SCIENCE(3)MATH
168.    (4)HISTORY(5)ENGLISH(6)READING(7)OTHER(8)ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
169.    (9)SECONDARY EDUCATION/
170.    QUES039,QUES040(0)NO ANSWER(1)EXTREMELY FAMILIAR
171.    (2)SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR(3)NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR/
172.    QUES041(0)NO ANSWER(1)LESS THAN 1 HOUR(2)1 HOUR
173.    (3)2 HOURS(4)3 HOURS(5)4 HOURS(6)5 HOURS(7)6-8 HOURS
174.    (8)9-10 HOURS(9)MORE THAN 10 HOURS/
175.    QUES43A(0)NO ANSWER(1)20-24 YEARS OLD(2)25-29 YEARS OLD
176.    (3)30-34 YEARS OLD(4)35-39 YEARS OLD(5)40-44 YEARS OLD
177.    (6)45-49 YEARS OLD(7)50-54 YEARS OLD(8)OVER 55 YEARS OLD/
178.    QUES43C,QUES43E(0)NO ANSWER(1)RURAL AREA(2)SUBURBAN AREA
179.    (3)URBAN AREA(4)INNER CITY AREA(5)URBAN & SUBURBAN
180.    (6)INNER CTY & SUBURBAN(7)INNER CITY & URBAN
181.    (8)RURAL & SUBURBAN(9)RURAL & URBAN/
182.    QUES43D,QUES43F(0)NO ANSWER(1)PUBLIC SCHOOL
183.    (2)PRIVATE, PAROCHIAL(3)BOTH/
184.    QUES43J(0)NO ANSWER(1)BALDWIN-WALLACE(2)CASE WESTERN RESERVE
185.    (3)CLEVELAND STATE(4)CUYAHOGA COMMUNITY(5)JOHN CARROLL
186.    (6)NOTRE DAME(7)ST. JOHN COLLEGE(8)URSULINE(9)OTHER/
```

```
187. MISSING VALUES QUES04A TO QUES04D,QUES012(0,1)
188. PROCESS SBFILESEACH
189. CODEBOOK        QUES001 TO QUES43K
190. STATISTICS      1
191. READ INPUT DATA

     (DATA_FILE)

192. PROCESS SBFILESALL
193. CODEBOOK        QUES001 TO QUES43K
194. STATISTICS      1
195. FINISH
```

APPENDIX K

DESCRIPTION OF THE STATISTICAL PACKAGE FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The questionnaire evaluation system described in this report uses a computerized approach to the tabulation of the student teacher and cooperating teacher questionnaires. Without a computerized approach, the task of preparing the tabulations for individual centers would be a very large task.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is a set of computer programs designed to simplify the tabulation of data of the type obtained through questionnaires.

The set of computer programs constituting SPSS can be found in most large computer facilities and many smaller ones particularly those associated with colleges and universities. The programs can be easily tailored to handle the results of a wide variety of questionnaires.

A variety of options are available including from a straight tabulation through crosstabulations and multivariate analyses. The option used to prepare the tabulations which appear in Appendices I and J is called CODEBOOK.

A manual which describes SPSS is available at computer facilities, at campus bookstores, or can be obtained from the publisher as shown below:

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
Norman Nie, Dale Bent, and C. Hull

McGraw Hill Book Company
330 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036